UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01968589 0

MANUAL

OF

UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY.

VOL. IV.

THIRD PERIOD

(A.D. 1648-1878).

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY

MANUAL

OF

UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE

REV. JOHN ALZOG, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG.

TRANSLATED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE NINTH AND LAST GERMAN EDITION.

BY THE

REV. F. J. PABISCH,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY AND OF CANON AND CIVIL LAW, PRESIDENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SEMINARY OF MOUNT ST. MARY'S OF THE WEST, CINCINNATI, OHIO;

AND THE

REV. THOMAS S. BYRNE,

PROFESSOR AT MOUNT ST. MARY'S SEMINARY.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

WITH CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES AND ECCLESIASTICO-GEOGRAPHICAL MAPS.

VOL. IV.

New Edition.

DUBLIN
M. H. GILL AND SON, O'CONNELL STREET
1892

Cincinnati, August 15th, 1874.

With no ordinary satisfaction we attach our "Imprimatur" to this most necessary Manual of Ecclesiastical History of the Rev. Dr. Alzog. The work, as it comes from the hands of the Rev. President and a Rev. Professor of our Seminary, may be considered an improvement on the original. It is better adapted to our needs, and from the favour with which the prospectus has been received by our Most Reverend and Right Reverend Prelates and Professors of Theology, we have no doubt of its being regarded as a valuable acquisition to ecclesiastical science.

✠ *J. B. PURCELL,*
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Baltimore, August 28th, 1874.

Dr. Alzog's Manual of Church History is by far the best compendium of Church History within my knowledge, and is specially fitted to be a text-book on the subject in Colleges and Seminaries. It is no mere compilation, as such books generally are, but a fresh and original history, such as could have been written only by a man of the most extensive and accurate learning. . . . I have looked over the proof-sheets you forwarded to me, and am convinced that this most excellent Manual has been much improved by your labours. It has been admirably "done into English," and its value as a text-book and guide in this most useful but much neglected branch of study is greatly increased by your brief notes, additional documents, &c. With sincere respect,

Very truly yours in Christ,

✠ *J. ROOSEVELT BAYLEY,*
Archbishop of Baltimore.

THE INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
10 ELMSLEY PLACE
TORONTO 5, CANADA.

JAN 5 - 1982

3744

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

SECOND EPOCH.

From the Peace of Westphalia down to Modern Times (1648-1878).

PART FIRST.

From the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution (1789)

PAGE

§ 361. Sources and Works—*Summary* 1

CHAPTER I. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 362. Popes of the Seventeenth Century 3
363. Popes of the Eighteenth Century 8
364. The Gallican Church—Gallican Liberties 16
365. Jansenism—*Case of Conscience—Quesnel—Schism of Utrecht* 19
366. Quietism—*Molinos, Guyon, Fénélon* 26
367. Literature of the Gallican Church 31
368. Decline of Religious and Theological Science in France—Influence of the Free-thinkers of England 35
369. The Catholic Church in Italy and *Spain* 41
370. The Catholic Church in Germany 46
371. Literary Activity—Unbelief—Superstition in Germany 53
372. Political and Religious Disturbances in Poland 60
373*a*. The Suppression of the Society of Jesus 63
373*b*. Worship and Discipline from the Sixteenth Century 70
374. Spread of Christianity 73

CHAPTER II. *History of Protestantism.*

§ 375. On the Constitution of the Protestant Churches and their Relations to the State—The Collegial System 79
376. Dogma and Theologians 80
377. Abandonment of Symbols as Rules of Dogmatic Belief—Influence of Modern Philosophy and its Consequences 84
378. Biblical Theologians—The False Enlightenment of Neologism—Classical Literature of Germany 88

PAGE

§ 379. The Herrnhutters 94
380. The Quakers 95
381. The Methodists 97
382. The Swedenborgians or Church of the New Jerusalem 99
383. Protestant Missions 101
384. Relations of Catholics to Protestants 102
385. The Russian Church under the Permanent Synod 105

PART SECOND.

From the French Revolution down to our own Day (1789-1878).

§ 386. General Literature—*Importance of Modern Church History* 108

CHAPTER I. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 387. The French National Assembly (*La Constituante*), 1789-1791 110
388. Legislative Assembly—National Convention—Directory—Consulate—Theophilanthropists 119
389. The Roman Republic—*Pius VI.;* he dies in exile 125
390. *Pontificate of Pius VII.*—French *Empire* 127
391. Disagreement between the Pope and the Emperor 135
392. Sad Condition of the Church in Germany, Italy, and Spain 143
393. The Restoration 147
394. Rehabilitation of the Pope—Re-establishment of the Jesuits 148
395. Reorganization of the Catholic Church in Sardinia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies 151
396. The Catholic Church in Germany—Congress of Vienna 152
397. Pontificate of *Leo XII.* and *Pius VIII.* 154
398. Pontificate of Gregory XVI. (1831-1846) 156
399. The Catholic Church in France under the Bourbons 160
400. Continuation—The Catholic Church in France under Louis Philippe ... 165
401. The Catholic Church in Spain 171
402. The Catholic Church in Portugal 176
403. New Birth of the Church in Great Britain and Ireland 178
404. The Catholic Church in Belgium and Holland 187
405. The Catholic Church in Switzerland 191
406. The Catholic Church in Austria 197
407. The Catholic Church in Bavaria 201
408. The Catholic Church in Prussia 204
409. The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine 211
410. The Catholic Church in Russia 216

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

411. His Political Activity 218
412. His Energy in Ecclesiastical Affairs 225
413*a* and *b*. *The Twentieth Œcumenical Council of the Vatican* and its Immediate Consequences 223
414. Revival of Religion in different Countries since 1846—In Portugal and Spain 251
415. In France 255
416. In Belgium and Holland 261
417. In Great Britain and Ireland 264
418. In Germany and Switzerland 275
419. Catholic Literature in Germany since the Opening of the Nineteenth Century 291
420. Activity of the Catholics of Germany in the Field of Speculative Theology 302
421. Sects in Germany 308
422. The Catholic Church in Russia and Poland 314
423. The Missions of the Catholic Church 316

PAGE

CHAPTER II. *History of Protestantism.*

SECTION FIRST.

History of Theology and of the Church in Germany.

§ 424. Futile Efforts to Preserve the Symbols of Protestantism 347
425. Influence of Modern Philosophy 350
426. The Ultimate Results of the Free Interpretation of Holy Scriptures ... 354
427. The Theology of Compromise and Independent Theology 356
428. Revival of Lutheranism—Modern Orthodoxy 360
429. The More Important Religious Movements in Germany: (*a.*) In Prussia; (*b.*) Outside of Prussia 364
430. Religious and Charitable Societies 366

SECTION SECOND.

History of Protestantism Outside of Germany.

431 Protestantism in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, France, Great Britain, and America 367
432. Enumeration of Sects, Ancient and Modern 374
433. Protestant Missions and Bible Societies 376
434. Respective Situation of Catholics and Protestants 382
435. Conclusion 389

I. Chronological Table of Popes and Emperors 393
II. Chronological Table of Principal Personages and Events 394
III. Chronological Table of Councils 399
IV. Table of Protestant Episcopal Sees out of the United Kingdom 400
V. Modern Councils held from 1682 to 1869 401
General Index 405

BQX
77

THIRD PERIOD.

SECOND EPOCH.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA DOWN TO MODERN TIMES, 1648-1878.

PART FIRST.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789)—PREVALENCE OF FALSE POLITICAL AND SCIENTIFIC THEORIES.

§ 361. *Sources and Works—Summary.*

I. Bullar. Roman., continued from Clement XIII., by *Barbieri*, Rom., 1835 sq. Acta, historico-eccl., Weim., 1736-1758, 24 vols. Nova acta hist. eccl., Weim., 1758-1773, 12 vols. Acta hist. eccl. nostri temporis, Weim., 1774-1787, 12 vols. Repertory to serve Modern Ch. H. (Index on all the above-mentioned), Weimar, 1790. Reports, Documents, and Statements to supply Modern Ch. H., Weimar, 1789-1793, 5 vols. *Collectio Lacensis*, Acta et decreta concilior. recent. ab an., 1682-1789, Friburgi Brisgav., 1871 sq., T. I. *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Lemgo, 1771-1783, 9 vols.; continued by *Planck*, Lemgo, 1787-1793, 3 vols. *Vater*, Cultivation of Modern Ch. H., Berlin, 1820 sq. 2 vols. Hist. and Theol. Review, edited by *Illgen*, from 1832; by *Niedner*, from 1846, by *Kahnis*, from 1866.

II. By "*some one*," Essay of a Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Lps., 1776 sq., 3 vols. *Schlegel*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Heilbron, 1784 sq., 2 vols.; and by *Fraas*, Vol. 3rd, Pt. I. (both being in continuation of Mosheim's). Cf. *Schroeckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Pt. VI.-IX. *Hagenbach*, Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 3rd ed., Lps., 1856, 2 pts., 4th revised ed., Lps., 1871, 1872; Engl. tr., by Rev. *J. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Baur*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century (Vol. IV., pp. 476-679, of the complete work). †**Huth*, Essay of a Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Augsburg, 1807-1809, 2 vols. †*Robiano*, Continuation de l'histoire de l'église de *Berault-Bercastel* depuis, 1721-1830 (Par., 1836, 4 T.), T. I. †*Henrion*, Hist. générale de l'église pendant les XVIII.-XIX. siècles, Par., 1836, T. I. †*Capefigue*, L'église, pendant les 4 derniers siècles, T. 2 et 3. *Rohrbacher*, Hist. univ. de l'église, T. 26 et 27. *F. Ancillon*, Tableau des révolutions du système polit. de l'Europe depuis la fin du 15 siècle, Berl., 1803 sq., 4 T.; Germ. by *Mann*, Berlin, 1804, 3 vols. *Schlosser*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, Heidelberg, 1836-1842, 3 vols. (to 1788). Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XVI. *Gfroerer*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, published by *Weiss*, Schaffh., 1862 sq., 3 vols. *Cesare Cantù*, Universal History, Germ. by *Bruehl*, Vols. XI. and XII.

No sooner had Protestantism secured political recognition, and consolidated its strength, than the influence of the principles of *pure state secularism*, so recklessly applied and consistently carried out in the Treaty of Westphalia, by Catholic and Protestant princes alike

became painfully apparent in the domain of both science and art. An utterly selfish and grasping policy, unrestrained by either human laws or supernatural principles, began to prevail. Under pretence of desiring to preserve the balance of power in Europe, the more powerful princes obtained by fraud or seized by violence territories which their weaker neighbours were unable to defend. To such frivolous and unscrupulous rulers the honest, straightforward policy set forth by *Fénélon* in the Telemachus was in the last degree distasteful.

In consequence of the conflicts resulting from such principles, the Houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg seized conjointly Southern Europe; and Prussia, now raised to the rank of a kingdom, began to play a prominent part in European affairs. After the return of the Electors of Saxony to the Catholic Church, Prussia, assuming the office of protector of Protestantism, introduced into the politics and religion of Germany the principles of Erastianism. On the other hand, Poland was dismembered; Russia began to take a prominent and dangerous part in the political affairs of Western Europe; and Protestant England wrested the sceptre of the seas from the Catholic powers, and reduced the kingdom of Ireland to the condition of a province.

To offset these extraordinary events in the political domain, there were no cheering results in the *religious;* the evidences of spiritual life and growth, even during the eighteenth century, when the productions of modern national literature were at once numerous and of exceptional merit, both in England and France, being neither important in themselves nor yet giving promise of better things. In every Catholic country, with the exception of France, the humiliating issue of the great religious conflicts produced a spirit of apathy and indifference, on the one hand, and on the other a haughty arrogance in *Catholic* princes, which they displayed in a readiness to quarrel with Popes and persecute Jesuits.

Again, Protestantism produced and fostered a radical and aggressive *Rationalism*, out of which issued the shallow and senseless philosophy of that age, whose single aim seems to have been to destroy the faith of mankind in the divine character of revelation. This rationalistic tendency ultimately exercised a most disastrous influence on the intellectual life of European countries, notably of France and Germany, where it was mainly instrumental in cultivating and creating a taste for that stupid *mock-enlightenment* which *Claudius* satirizes with caustic severity in the Wandsbeck Messenger. (See § 378).

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 362. *Popes of the Seventeenth Century.*

Guarnacci, Vitæ et res gestæ Romanor. Pontiff. et Cardinal. a Clem. X. usque ad Clem. XI., Rom., 1751, 2 T. f. *Ant. Sandini*, Vitæ Pontiff. Rom. ex antiq. monum. collectæ, Patav., 1739, 8vo; Bamberg, 1753, 8vo. Storia critico-chronologica di Rom. Pontefici (to Clem. XIII.) e di generali e provinciali concilii scritta da *Giuseppe Abbate Piatti*, Napoli, 1765-1770. *Bower*, Hist. of the Popes, revised by *Rambach*, Vol. X., Pt. II. *Ranke*, Hist. of the Papacy during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Vol. III. Hist. of the Popes, by *Haas*, p. 608 sq.; by *Groene*, Vol. II., p. 400 sq.

THE papal power received a rude and terrible shock during the pontificate of *Innocent X.* In concluding the Peace of Westphalia, the Court of Rome was utterly ignored by both Catholic and Protestant princes; most of the ecclesiastical property of Germany, including abbeys and bishoprics, was secularized, and the relations of the civil to the spiritual power completely severed. The influence of the Church in the affairs of State and in political movements entirely ceased. By losing its political prestige, the Holy See lost also much of its moral ascendency and consideration with the people of Europe; and there was abundant reason to fear that these unparalleled acts of aggression might end in an attack upon the papacy itself, and in an attempt to fetter the Pope in the legitimate exercise of the essential functions of his office. To these encroachments upon his privileges and violations of his rights, Innocent could offer only a feeble and ineffectual protest.

If the events of the closing epoch were disheartening to the Sovereign Pontiff, the conditions which characterized the one just opening were calculated to fill his mind with just alarm. While some of the worldly-minded *bishops* gave him but a feeble support, and others became his open and avowed enemies, *Catholic princes*, and especially those of the Houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg, who tyrannized over a great portion of Europe, were more shameless in their treatment of him and more malicious in their hostility than even the Protestants themselves.

Innocent was succeeded by Cardinal Fabio Chigi, who took the name of *Alexander VII.* (1655-1667). The severity of his morals, his aversion to pomp and luxury, his prudence, and his capacity for business seemed to promise that his reign would be more happy and prosperous than the one just closed had been. But the hopes built upon the talents and virtues he had displayed as a cardinal and diplomatist were prevented from being realized by the fault of the Pontiff himself. He called his grasping relations to Rome, and when he appeared in public it was with a pomp and splendour such as had

never before been witnessed or even thought of in that city of magnificent displays. He had, however, the unexpected and gratifying pleasure of learning that *Christina*, Queen of Sweden, and daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, the great Protestant hero, had abjured the creed of her father and embraced the Catholic faith, first privately at Brussels, and afterwards solemnly and publicly in the church of the Franciscans at *Innsbruck*. From her infancy up she had been deeply and favourably impressed with the beauty of many Catholic practices; and as she grew in years, the solemn grandeur of the Catholic Church, her worship and her ritual, inspired in her soul feelings of reverence and awe. In this frame of mind, she came upon the words of Cicero "*that possibly all the opinions of men concerning religion might be false, but that more than one of them could be true was impossible*,"[1] the truth of which nearly overpowered her and opened out to her a serious train of thought. This led her to inquire which was the true religion. That God should have left man without such seemed to her inconceivable; for to say that the Author of our being had implanted in the heart and conscience a want that could not be satisfied, was very like taxing him with a cruel tyranny. Having found in the Catholic Church the true religion so earnestly sought, she forthwith hastened to carry into effect the promise she had made while still in search of it. "O my God," she was wont to say, "Thou knowest how often I have besought Thee, in language unintelligible to other minds, to give me light; and how I have promised to obey thy call at any cost, even the sacrifice of my fortune and my life." She laid down the crown of Sweden, which she could not wear as a Catholic, and was unwilling to remain in a country whose sovereignty she had transferred to another. At the Pope's invitation, she came to Italy, and visiting Loreto, placed her sceptre and crown in the shrine of Our Lady as a thank-offering. But, while laying aside the titles and functions of royalty, she retained her naturally haughty, and at times despotic, manner, which some of those about her, both at Rome and Fontainebleau, learned to their cost. As time went on, however, her temper became more even, her mind more composed, her character more amiable, and her manners more engaging. Being a woman of extraordinary talents and unusual acquirements, she drew about her a number of artists and savants, upon whom she exercised no little influence, and in this way did much to promote the progress of many branches of science and art. She died at Rome, April 19, 1689, and received the exceptional honour of a tomb in St. Peter's Church. Another conversion, very similar to Christina's in many respects, was that of the scholarly *Ernest*, Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels.[2]

[1] De natura Deorum, 1, 2.

[2] *Grauert*, Christina of Sweden and her Court, Bonn, 1837 sq., 2 vols. *Ranke*, Roman Pontiffs, Vol. III., pp. 77-103. "Digression on Christina of Sweden." Relation de tout ce qui se passa entre le Pape Alex. et le roi de France, Col., 1670. *Desmarais*, Histoire des démêlés de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome, Par., 1706, 4to. Poetical Essays of this Pope: *Philomathi*, labores juveniles, 1656, f. *Raess*, Bp. of Strasburg, Converts, Vol. VII., p. 62 sq. Concerning Landgrave Ernest, Cf. ibidem, Vol. VI., p. 465 sq.

But if these events brought comfort to the heart of the Pontiff, there were others that gave him no little pain and annoyance. As nuncio at the Conference of Münster, Alexander had given offence to France; and, after his accession to the papacy, France in turn, under the governments of Cardinal *Mazarin* († 1661), and especially of *Louis XIV.*, settled the score by causing him all the trouble they decently could, thus clouding and embittering his life. It would seem that Louis gave formal instructions to the *Duke of Créqui*, his ambassador, to heap indignities upon the Pope. There is no other way of adequately accounting for the extraordinary conduct of the ambassador himself and the ruffians of his retinue, which so irritated the Pope's body-guard that, smarting under the insult, they refused to respect the sacredness of the hôtel of the French Embassy (1662). This so incensed Louis that he ordered the papal envoys to quit France under escort; caused the papal city of Avignon and the territory of Venaissin to be occupied by his troops; and despatched an army into Italy to obtain satisfaction. The treaty of Pisa followed (1664), the humiliating terms of which the Pope had no alternative but to accept. Alexander, however, renewed friendly relations with the Republic of Venice; obtained from it the restoration of the confiscated property of the Congregation of the Canons Regular of the Holy Ghost, which he devoted to defraying the expenses of the war against the Turks, and sought and received permission for the banished Jesuits to return.[1] Finally, Alexander erected many magnificent structures, which largely contributed to the embellishment of Rome. Among these were the Archigymnasium of the Sapienza, which he enriched with a splendid library, and the collonade surrounding the piazza or square before St. Peter's Church. The costliness of these and other improvements, together with the rapacity of his relatives, exhausted his resources, and led to financial embarrassment.

Clement IX. (Rospigliosi, 1667-1669), like his predecessor, was a lover of letters and a poet; but, unlike him, he was a tolerable financier, and was partially successful in repairing the disordered state of the papal exchequer. He advanced large sums of money to the Republic of Venice to enable it to prosecute a war against the Turks. He was mainly instrumental in bringing about the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1668), thus reconciling France and Spain; and he impressed upon the mind of Louis XIV. the conviction that his real interests, his true glory, and the welfare of his soul all demanded that he should restrain his lust for conquest.

The kingdom of Portugal had been independent since the time of John IV. (1641); but the Pope, not wishing to give offence to the Spanish sovereigns, declined to recognize it. Clement, putting such notions aside, gave it a formal recognition, acknowledging the reigning prince, Dom Pedro, as its king, and confirming the bishops appointed by that sovereign. He also took a lively interest in the

[1] See Vol. 3, page 439 sq.

foreign missions, and, among other regulations drawn up by him for the guidance of the missionaries, was one forbidding them for the future to engage in commercial enterprises of any kind. The news that the island of Candia (Crete) had been taken by the Turks, a disaster which he had done so much to avert, caused him such pain that he died of grief, December 9, 1669.

After his death the papal throne remained vacant for five months, when *Emilio Altieri*, then in his eightieth year, was elected, and took the name of *Clement X.* (1670-1676). This pontificate marks the beginning of an era still more disastrous than that of preceding ones in the history of the Popes. Following the example set them by the King of France, the Catholic sovereigns of other countries sought to strip the Holy Father of all influence, and to seize the revenues of the Church in their respective States. With a view to aiding the Poles in their struggle against the Turks, Clement opened negotiations with the Tsar, *Alexei Michaelowicz*, who sent an embassy to Rome to obtain from the Pope the title of Emperor. It was during this reign that the question of the *Right of Regalia* arose in France, which afterwards became so celebrated and so productive of evil. By the Right of Regalia was meant an abusive custom introduced into France, by which the Crown claimed the revenues of vacant bishoprics and the collation of simple benefices, the disposal of which in justice belonged to the incoming bishops. This right, at first restricted to such churches as had been founded by the Kings of France, had been extended during the reign of Henry IV. to all the churches in the kingdom. This violation of ecclesiastical rights, which only the two bishops of *Pamiers* and *Alais* had the courage to resist, was confirmed by Louis XIV. in two edicts, published respectively in 1673 and 1674. Clement died before the close of the controversy.

His successor, *Innocent XI.* (Odescalchi, 1676-1689), was a man of rare ability and an avowed enemy of nepotism.[1] He published a number of very useful decrees on discipline, and exercised unusual discrimination in the appointment of bishops. To remedy the disordered condition of the finances of the States of the Church, he placed at the disposal of the exchequer all the offices and emoluments hitherto in the hands of the nephews of preceding Popes. The residences of foreign ambassadors had been, previously to this reign, privileged places of asylum for criminals, and Innocent, by withdrawing the privilege, involved himself in heated controversies with the different courts of Europe. Most of the princes, however, yielded their claim on receiving full explanations from the Pope. Louis XIV. neither asked nor waited for explanations, and his ambassador and suite, to show their contempt of papal authority, carried themselves more like soldiers in a conquered country than representatives of a foreign king at a friendly court. Louis, as has been stated,

[1] Vita d'Innoc. XI., 1690, 4to; *Bonamici*, De Vita et rebus gestis Innocentis XI., Romæ, 1776.

occupied Avignon, and, with a view to justifying his conduct in this and other matters, *appealed from the judgment of the Pope to that of a General Council.* In the meantime, the controversy on the subject of the *Regalia* was carried on with unabated earnestness. The appeals of the Bishops of *Pamiers* and *Alais* were favourably received by the Pope; and Louis called an assembly of the French clergy, consisting of thirty-four archbishops and bishops, two agents of the clergy, and thirty-six priests, all of whom were in the interest of the king, and from whom he obtained the celebrated "Declaration" of 1682, containing the "*Four Articles,*" which are regarded as the charter of the so-called "*Gallican Liberties.*" The Pope protested against the "Declaration," and the king commanded that its provisions be enforced throughout the whole of his dominions. The work was accomplished, and the evil done, and of its gravity there could be only one opinion. During these troubles and conflicts the holiness of Innocent was such that the people esteemed him a saint; and, to comfort the closing days of his life, he learned that *John Sobieski* had gained a brilliant victory over the Turks before Vienna, and that the Gospel was being rapidly spread among the heathen. But the event which contributed perhaps as much as any other to gladden his heart was the arrival at Rome of a deputation, sent by a number of schismatical bishops, to convey to the Holy Father the profession of their submission to the Holy See.

The holy Innocent was succeeded by *Alexander VIII.* (Ottoboni, 1689-1691), who, being a native of Venice, very naturally rendered what help he could to the Republic in its struggle with the Turks. Although he had obtained from Louis XIV. the restoration of Avignon and Venaissin, he was not deterred from publishing a brief, in which he condemned the Four Articles of the Gallican Liberties. It was also during his pontificate that the valuable library of Christina, ex-Queen of Sweden, was added to that of the Vatican. The memory of Alexander has unfortunately suffered much from the misconduct of his nephews, to whom, on account of his advanced age, he allowed a large share in the government.

His successor, *Innocent XII.* (Pignatelli, 1691-1700), took Innocent XI. as his pattern and model in governing the Church. He published a bull, expressly forbidding nepotism; enacted useful and severe laws regarding the execution of justice and reformation of morals within the Papal States; and provided carefully for the poor, whom he called his nephews, putting the Lateran palace at their service as an hospital. After a long and by no means agreeable experience, Louis XIV. was forced to give the French bishops leave to write to the Pope, to state that they very much regretted the Declaration of 1682, and that they regarded it as invalid. The king himself had previously written to say "that it gave him great pleasure to be able to inform His Holiness that, in whatever related to the Declaration of the clergy, he had taken the necessary steps to render inoperative the ordinances of 1682, which he was driven to enact by

force of circumstances." The Pope, in turn, confirmed the appointments made to bishoprics during the continuance of the controversy. Possibly no official act of his pontificate caused Innocent more pain than the condemnation of the work of the noble Archbishop Fenelon, entitled "*Maxims of the Saints.*" Innocent died September 27, 1700, during the celebration of the centenary jubilee, which vast numbers of pilgrims, obedient to his call, were flocking to Rome to celebrate.

§ 363. *Popes of the Eighteenth Century.*

After some delay and hesitation, *Clement XI.* (Albani, 1700-1721), ascended the papal throne. A prince of the House of Albani, he was an accomplished scholar, a man of independent character, and an able and eloquent preacher.[1] From the very beginning of his reign he saw himself surrounded with difficulties of no ordinary kind. *Frederic I.* had lately (1700) accepted the title of *King of Prussia;* but as the Teutonic Order had once owned the Duchy of Prussia, and had never surrendered its claim, Pope Clement protested against the *royal* assumptions of Frederic; and the protest, which has been often renewed by his successors,[2] has been the occasion of much *affected surprise*, and no little misrepresentation, by the enemies of the Papacy. Contrary to his wish, Clement was also made a party to the disputes arising out of the War of Succession in Spain, which, following close upon the death of Charles II., he had done all in his power to prevent.

Joseph I., Emperor of Germany, believing that the Pope was disposed to look with favour upon the claims of France, and to oppose the recognition of his own brother as King of Spain, prepared to make him feel the full weight of his anger. His troops pillaged the States of the Church, and his generals concluded an alliance with the Dukes of Parma and Piacenza, for the purpose of laying the clergy under contribution. To the already existing troubles of the Pope another was added, viz., the controversy on the *right of presentation* to cathedral churches and religious foundations. The Pope threatened excommunication, and began to prepare for war; but at the approach of the imperial troops he was forced to make peace; to lay aside his arms; to recognize Charles III. as King of Spain, and to grant him the investiture of the kingdom of Naples.

When *Philip V. of Anjou* learned the conditions of this treaty he was so incensed that he ordered the Papal Nuncio to quit Spain, and forbade all intercourse between his subjects and the Holy See.

Finally, Clement was drawn into another controversy with Victor

[1] Opp. Rom., 1722. Frcf., 1729, 2 T., f. *Buder*, The Life of Clement XI., Frkft., 1721, 3 vols. (Polidoro) Libb. VI. de vita et reb. gest. Clem. XI., Urb., 1724. *Reboulet*, Hist. de Clém. XI., Avign., 1752, 2 T., 4to.

[2] The Pope (Epp. et brevia selectiora, pp. 43 sq., ed. Frcf.) says: Fridericum marchionem Brandenburgensem nomen et insignia regis Prussiæ inaudito forte hactenus apud Christianos more nec sine gravi antiqui juris, *quod ea provincia sacro et militari Teutonicorum ordini competit*, violatione sibi publice arrogasse.

Amadeus of Savoy, in 1711, contrary to whose will he had published sentence of excommunication against certain magistrates of that country for their contemptuous disregard of the rights of the Church. But there was a still more serious cause of complaint against Amadeus. Having ascended the throne of Sicily in virtue of the stipulations of the Peace of Utrecht (1713), this prince proceeded, without the Pope's consent, to arrogate to himself the ecclesiastical prerogatives of the "*Sicilian Monarchy*,"[1] which he well knew had always been denied to the Sicilian monarchs. Having placed the kingdom of Sicily under interdict, the Pope was under the necessity of supporting three thousand Sicilian ecclesiastics, who, fleeing from the country, sought refuge in Rome. Thus were the troubles of the Holy See daily increasing in number and gravity. The Pope was encouraged to maintain his firm and resolute attitude by *the memory of the great influence exercised in times past by the Holy See;* but, while not lacking in courage himself, he received but scant support from the Catholic sovereigns, who, like their Protestant neighbours, sought to take upon themselves the exercise of spiritual powers, and to use both religion and the Head of the Church only to further their selfish political aims. To remedy these evils, the Pope did what he could, but to no purpose; his protests were unheeded, and his voice fell upon ears that would not hear.

During the pontificate of *Innocent XIII.* (1721-1724), the differences existing between the kingdom of Naples and the Holy See were terminated. In consideration of an annual tribute of six thousand ducats, transported to Rome on a white palfrey, the Pope consented to recognize the claim of Charles VI. to the title of king; although this condescension on the part of Innocent did not prevent the emperor, in spite of protests, from transferring to Don Carlos the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which for two hundred years had been fiefs of the Holy See. By the premature death of Innocent, the Church lost a wise, prudent, and enlightened ruler, whose official life seems absolutely without fault, unless, indeed, the unfortunate elevation of the unworthy Abbé Dubois to a place in the College of Cardinals, a mistake that might happen to anyone, be regarded as such.

Benedict XIII. (Orsini, 1724-1730), after his election, begged with tears in his eyes not to be forced to accept the pontifical dignity;[2] and if he finally consented, he did so only because of the obedience which as a Dominican he owed to the Superior of his Order. He dearly loved a cloistral life; his heart was in his convent, and he dreaded going out into the world. Shortly after his election he published various sumptuary regulations, restricting the luxurious habits of the cardinals, prescribing modesty of dress to the clergy, &c. A *council*

[1] See Vol. II., p. 371 sq.

[2] Opp. theol., Rom., 1728, 3 T., f. Icon et mentis et cordis Ben. XIII., Frcf., 1723. *Alex. Borgia*, Ben. XIII. vita, Rom., 1752, 4to; his Life and Acts, Frkft., 1731

convoked by him in the Lateran palace (1725) made many wise enactments for the suppression of scandals and abuses, and decreed that the bull *Unigenitus*, directed against the errors of *Quesnel*, should be received as a rule of faith throughout the Universal Church. Benedict recovered the town of *Comacchio*, which had been in the hands of the emperor since 1708, and came to an understanding with Charles regarding the Sicilian monarchy, in virtue of which he granted to that monarch and his successors the right of appointing the so-called "*Judge of the Monarchy*," whom he invested with very ample powers, limiting his own jurisdiction *to matters of essential importance*. He also terminated the controversy between the Holy See and the Dukes of Sardinia and Savoy, on the understanding that, while enjoying the right of patronage over the churches and convents within their States, they should not appropriate the revenues of vacant bishoprics, which were to be expended for the benefit of the churches. He was not so successful in maintaining friendly relations with Portugal, whose king, John V., in a rude and insolent letter, demanded that *Bicchi*, who had been Nuncio at Lisbon, and recently recalled, should be created a Cardinal. The college protested, and John, irritated at the refusal of the Pope to accede to his demand, ordered home the Portuguese then residing in Rome; interdicted all intercourse between his kingdom and the Holy See; and forbade the convents of Portugal to send their customary alms to Rome (1725).

The Feast of *St. Gregory VII.*, which had heretofore been celebrated only by the Benedictine Order and the Chapter of Salerno, was now extended to the Universal Church, and, strange to say, was the occasion of no little trouble to the Pontiff. The governments of Venice, France, and Austria affected great displeasure, in that mention had been made in the lessons of the Office of the excommunication and deposition of the Emperor Henry IV.

Benedict was also unfortunate in taking into his confidence Cardinal Coscia, by whose simulated piety he was deceived, and by whose abuse of power and influence the Church was dishonoured and he himself enriched.

Clement XII. (Corsini, 1730-1740), at the close of a distinguished career, and when far advanced in age, was raised to the papal throne, and while there did much to promote justice and advance the arts and sciences. He was the founder of the Museum of Roman Antiquities, and sent the learned *Assemani* to the East in search of manuscripts, of which they procured a number of very valuable ones. He ended the difficulty with Portugal by creating Bicchi a cardinal; but was almost immediately involved in fresh complications with Spain. "It would seem that since the opening of the century the princes of Europe had made up their minds that, instead of the respectful deference with which the Holy See had been treated in time past, they would exhibit towards it only insolent rudeness and arbitrary self-will." So notorious was their conduct in this respect, that even the Protestant princes, in their intercourse with the Head of the

Catholic Church, treated him with more consideration than the Catholics themselves. On the death of the Duke Anthony, in 1731, the Pope made a fresh attempt to recover the Duchy of Parma, but was not more successful than his predecessors had been. To aid in the conversion of the Greeks, he founded a school of theology at *Bissignano*, in Calabria (*Seminarium Corsini*); and, by a bull of the year 1738, he condemned the order of *Freemasons*, and the condemnation was renewed in 1751 by Benedict XIV.

After the death of Clement XII., the cardinals went into conclave, and, at the expiration of six months, finally agreed upon Cardinal Lambertini, who as Pope took the name of *Benedict XIV.* (1740-1758). He was one of the *most learned* men that ever filled the papal throne. He at once applied himself to restore the finances from the disordered condition into which they had fallen, owing to the extravagance into which *Benedict XIII.* had been driven by Cardinal Coscia, and the enormous sums expended by Clement XII. on public buildings. To effect this he encouraged agriculture, promoted the manufacturing interests, and discountenanced all sorts of extravagance and luxury.[1] He published wise ordinances for the amelioration of the clergy, some of which were favourable to the Dominicans and adverse to the Jesuits; abolished certain *holy days* of obligation, or rather reduced their number, in those States in which it was represented there were too many (1748); and, by his moderation, prudently discriminating between claims that must be maintained and those that might be surrendered, re-established friendly relations between the Holy See and the different Courts of Europe. In the year 1740 he granted to John V. of Portugal the right of appointing to all bishoprics and prebends falling vacant within his kingdom, and eight years later conferred upon him the title of "*Most Faithful*" (*Rex fidelissimus*).

Conjointly with the King of Naples he established in that city a tribunal, consisting of an equal number of clerical and lay members, and presided over by an ecclesiastic, before which all ecclesiastical causes were to be brought for adjudication.[2] In 1753 he concluded a Concordat with Spain, by which, while reserving to the Holy See the right of appointment to fifty-two of the more considerable benefices, he surrendered his claims to the exercise of similar jurisdiction over the lesser ones, in consideration of the payment of a large indemnity.[3] A similar compromise was made in the case of Sardinia. He also attempted to compromise the dispute pending between Austria and the Republic of Venice concerning the patriarchate of Aquileia, deciding that the patriarchal rights should be divided between the Archbishopric of Goerz, in Austria, and that of Udine, in the States of

[1] *Bened. XIV.*, Opp. ed. *Azevedo*, Rom., 1747-1751, 12 vols., f.; his bulls (Bullar. M., Luxemb., 1754, T. XVII.-XIX.), and acta hist. eccl., Vol. I., p. 144 sq.; Vol. IV., p. 1058 sq.; Vol. XV., p. 907 sq., 637 sq. Cf. *Guarnacci*, L. c., p. 942; T. II., p. 487 sq. Vie du Pape Bénéd. XIV., Par., 1783, 12mo. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 31, pp. 153-177.

[2] Mosheim, Ch. H., Germ. by *Schlegel*, Vol. V., p. 666.

[3] *Schroeckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Vol. VI., p. 447.

Venice (1751). The decision, however, was unfavourably received by the Republic, which, in consequence, published an ordinance (1754) forbidding any bull, brief, or summons from the Holy See to be made public until after it had been submitted to the supervision and received the sanction of the Government. This was the only important question remaining unsettled at the time of Benedict's death. In many public documents Benedict gave the *title of king* to the ruler of Prussia. He conferred many favours on the *Society of Nobles* (*Societas nobilium*), an association formed in Hungary for the defence and propagation of the Catholic religion. As has been stated, he renewed the condemnation of the Freemasons, published by Clement XII., because all wise and good Christians were of opinion that the aims of that body were wicked and its methods evil. Finally, he has left behind him as monuments of his profound erudition and the wide range of his learning, not alone numerous and important works, which place him in the front rank among the scholars and writers of that age, but also societies founded by him to promote the study of *Roman and Christian Antiquities* and *Canon Law*, which have since become famous, adding no little lustre to his name. Though of easy manners and amiable disposition, charming all who approached him, his brilliant wit and caustic speeches at times were a source of annoyance to oversensitive persons.

His successor, *Clement XIII.* (Rezzonico, 1758-1769), as Bishop of Padua, enjoyed a high reputation for sanctity ; but being an avowed friend of the Jesuits, he was, from the very opening of his pontificate, involved in ceaseless contentions with the various courts of Europe, notably with the Bourbon kings of France, Spain, and Naples.[1] It gave him great pain, which was still more intensified by the consciousness of his inability to relieve the sufferers, to learn that *Pombal*, the Portuguese Minister of State, and *Pereira*, the canonist of the Court, were pursuing the Jesuits with all manner of persecution, heaping calumnies upon them, and meditating their expulsion from the kingdom (1559). In the following year his own Nuncio was obliged to quit the country, being conducted under escort across the frontier. In spite of their complete vindication by the bishops, and the Pope's energetic protests, the Jesuits were suppressed in France in 1764, in Spain in 1767, and in Naples in 1768.

His method of dealing with the *Duke of Parma* was very different. This prince had published a statute of *mortmain*, specially directed against the clergy, and had otherwise limited their immunities and prerogatives. In this case Clement took high ground, informing the usurper that he spoke to him not only as Pope, but also as one exercising the right of suzerainty over the Duchy. The French and Neapolitan branches of the Bourbons espoused the cause of the Duke; demanded the withdrawal of the pontifical brief; and seized the estates of the Church, the former taking possession of Avignon and Venaissin, and

[1] *Bower-Rambach*, Vol. X., Sect. II., p. 381 sq.

the latter of Benevento. They were all the more committed to this course, when, instead of yielding, the Pope resisted with firmness and dignity; renewed the confirmation of the Society of Jesus; and invoked the aid of *Maria Teresa*, to whom and her successors, as sovereigns of Hungary, he gave the title of "*Apostolic Majesty*" (*Rex Apostolicus*). To his appeal she replied "that the affairs of which he spoke being of a political and not religious character, she could not rightfully interfere."

It would almost seem that the sovereigns of Europe had conspired together to avenge the real or imaginary wrongs which they had at any time suffered or fancied they had suffered at the hands of the papacy; and that the Holy See, after having successfully resisted the violent assaults of Protestant princes during the preceding period, was fated to go down under the blows of *Catholic princes* in the present one. And so violent did this spirit of outrage become, that even the petty *Republic of Genoa* demanded of the Roman Court a tax of six thousand scudi for the mere privilege of allowing the papal envoy to Corsica to enter its territory.

In the beginning of the year 1769, the envoys of the various Bourbon Courts demanded that the Pope should unconditionally abolish the Society of Jesus, and the demand so agitated the Holy Father that he did not live to attend a consistory which he had called for the 3rd of February, to consider the matter, having died the day previous, without being at all confined to his bed.

Cardinal *Ganganelli*, of the Order of St. Francis, was unanimously elected May 14, 1769, by the cardinals in the interest of the civil powers, and on ascending the papal throne took the name of *Clement XIV.* (1769-1774). He at once set about reconciling the Bourbon princes to the Holy See.[1] He began by adjusting the difficulties with Parma, after which he raised the brother of Pombal, Minister to Portugal, to the dignity of the cardinalate, and confirmed the appointment of *Pereira* to the bishopric of Coimbra. The practice of annually reading the bull "*In Cœna Domini*" being offensive to many princes, the Pope abolished it *for ever*, and immediately after Avignon, Venaissin, and Benevento were restored to the Holy See, and Portugal consented to again receive a Papal Nuncio. Still it was not all fair sailing with Clement, who found himself obliged to resist the arbitrary proceedings of Spain, Naples, and Venice, concerning the disposal of church property. He also endeavoured to counteract the growing influence of *Febronianism* in Germany, and sent words of encouragement to the Poles, with whose political and religious troubles

[1] La Vie du Pape Clém. XIV. par le Marq. de *Carraccioli*, Par., 1775; Germ., Frkft., 1776. Lettres intéres-santes Du P. Clém. XIV., trad. du lat. et de l'ital. par *Carraccioli*, Par., 1776 sq., 3 T., and frequently in Italian and German (supposititious in several passages). Life of Pope Clement XIV., Berlin and Lps., 1774, 1775, 3 vols. *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., pp. 3-54, 201-248. *Reumont*, Ganganelli, Pope Clement XIV.: His Letters and His Age, Berlin, 1847. *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Lps., 1853, 2 vols. By the *same*, Clementis XIV. epistolæ et brevia, Paris, 1853.

he deeply sympathized. But what gave him the greatest pain and anxiety was the peremptory demand made by the Bourbon Courts for the suppression of the Jesuits. Unfortunately, during the first year of his pontificate, he had given his word to the Governments of Spain (September 30, 1769) and France (November 30) that, being fully convinced that the Society of Jesus no longer accomplished for the Church the special work contemplated by its founders, he would of his own free will, and without external constraint or influence, order its suppression, which he did by the *brief Dominus ac Redemptor*, bearing date of July 21, 1773, of which there will be again occasion to speak further on.[1] There was a suspicion that he had died of poison, but that it was without foundation is shown by the sworn declaration of *Marzoni*, a member of the Order of Franciscan Conventuals, and by the statement of the attending physicians.

Pius VI. (Angelo Braschi, 1774-1799), ascending the papal throne at a season full of political and religious difficulties,[2] and fully alive to the critical condition of affairs, said prophetically to the cardinals after his election: "*Your pleasure is my misfortune.*" The early part of Pius' reign is marked by the foundation of the *Pio-Clementine Museum*, containing some of the noblest art-treasures in the world; and by the drainage of the *Pontine Marsh*, undertaken and prosecuted without any regard to cost. Shortly after the death of Maria Teresa (1780), her son, *Joseph II.*, threw himself into the ranks, or rather placed himself at the head of those whose one aim was to bring into discredit the authority of the Holy See. To secularise and abolish Religious Orders, to spoil the property of the Church, to fill episcopal sees without the authorization of the Pope, to deprive papal nunciatures of their spiritual jurisdiction, to separate churches from the Centre of Unity and make them national, and to do all this under pretext of introducing useful and necessary reforms, appears to have been the aim of his life and the scope of his ambition.[3] Most of the Governments of Europe, in their relations to the Church and her Head, carried into practical effect the principles of Voltaire, then rapidly gaining ground in France, and of which they themselves were soon to become the victims. Joseph II. enacted that all papal bulls and episcopal ordinances should receive the imperial *placet* before publication; remodelled the oath to be taken by bishops; abrogated the *reservation* of benefices to the Pope; forbade anyone to accept, without his consent, titles or dignities bestowed by the Holy See; prohibited all intercourse between the convents of his empire and those of the same Order in other countries; placed monastic houses under the jurisdiction of the ordinary of the dioceses in which they were situated; exempted Religious Orders from obedience to their respec-

[1] *Leo*, Text-Book of Universal History, Vol. IV., p. 476 sq.

[2] *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., p. 60 sq. *Walch*, Mod. Hist. of Re'., Pt. V., p. 257 sq. Hist. of Pius VI. (Vienna), 1799.

[3] Consult on the subject the recent works by *Arneth*, *Brunner*, *Ritter*, and *Wolf*, quoted below, at the head of § 370.

tive generals resident in Rome; and suppressed many monasteries of men and all convents of women, except those of the Ursulines and Salesians, which were spared to carry on the work of education, but their number was nevertheless considerably reduced.[1] The suppressed monasteries and convents were turned into hospitals, universities, barracks, and military magazines, and their confiscated revenues employed in establishing four hundred new parishes "for the more easy access to public worship," and in endowing the same, forty millions of florins being set apart and deposited in the treasury for this purpose. This "*Religious Fund*" gradually melted away till only one-half the original amount remained; and the "cameralistic domains," consisting of the confiscated real estate of the Religious Orders, was so mismanaged as to be wholly unproductive to the State. He attempted to reform some religious houses after his own fashion; and, while professing an ardent zeal to purify religion of what he was pleased to term superstitious practices, prohibited pilgrimages and processions, and abolished religious confraternities.

For the instruction of youth in their religious duties a politico-moral catechism was published, and, by imperial order, introduced into all schools. Diocesan seminaries were suppressed, and their place supplied by others of a more general character; and all candidates for Holy Orders were required to pass through an examination of unusual severity.

At the *Congress of Ems*, in 1786, the Archbishops of Mentz, Treves, Cologne, and Salzburg attempted to give some sort of ecclesiastical sanction to these imperial measures. Joseph's example was closely copied by his brother *Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany*, who in turn received sympathy and encouragement from *Scipio Ricci*, Bishop of Pistoja; by the *Republic of Venice;* and by *Tanucci*, the *Neapolitan* minister.[2] The *Spanish Court*, too, was highly incensed against the Holy See because of its refusal to place Bishop Palafox, the determined enemy of the Jesuits, upon the catalogue of the Saints; while in both Italy and Germany an animated discussion was taking place on the question of clerical celibacy.[3]

To avert the dangers which, originating with the Government of Austria, though not sanctioned by the faithful people of that country, seriously threatened the Holy See, Pius VI. determined to go in person to Vienna, in the hope that, by the influence of his presence and the authority of his apostolical office, he might obtain the repeal of laws so hostile to the Church and so destructive of the best interests of the State. His journey was one uninterrupted triumph. The inhabitants of the cities and towns through which he passed came out as one man to greet him, and kneeling begged his blessing. In this universal expression of joy at having the Head of the Church in their

[1] In 1780, there were in the Austrian dominions 2,024 convents, and 63,000 monks and nuns. The former were reduced to 1,300, and the latter to 27,000. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Walch*, Ch. H., Pt. V., pp. 2-218.

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 437 sq.

midst, there were but two who did not share—two whose conduct plainly showed that the presence of the Holy Father was irksome to them—and these were the emperor and his arrogant old minister, *Kaunitz*. The emperor declined to assist at the Pontifical Office; forbade his subjects to even speak to the Pope without special leave from him; and, to prevent any secret access to his person, walled up all the doors of his lodgings except one, which was strongly guarded. To a request from Pius for a conference on affairs of State, the emperor replied that he had no knowledge of public business, which he left entirely to the members of his council, to whom the Pope might submit his views in writing. In his intercourse with the Holy Father, Kaunitz was uniformly and studiously vulgar. He would rudely shake the extended hand of the Holy Father, instead of kissing it, as Catholic usage and ordinary courtesy require; he abstained from visiting the Pontiff; and when the latter, under pretence of going through his gallery of paintings, sought an interview, the minister received him in a light morning-gown. After a fruitless stay of four weeks, during which he accomplished no more than the obtaining of a simple promise that nothing should be done prejudicial to either the doctrines of the Church or the dignity of her Head, he quitted the city, and set out for Rome. But the impression which his presence and dignified bearing had left upon the minds of both clergy and people was deep and enduring; and the scurrilous pamphlets, which the canonist, *Valentine Eybel*, and others equally infamous, published against him, were powerless to counteract its beneficial effects. The emperor accompanied his august visitor as far as Mariabrunn, where he took leave of him; and a few hours later, as if to show to the world that the Pope had produced no change in his sentiments, ordered a convent established in that locality to be suppressed.[1] These assaults against the papal power culminated in the French Revolution, of which Pius was the most illustrious victim. After 1789, all the ecclesiastical estates in France were declared national property; but the details of the events of these memorable years belong to the *second half* of the present Epoch.

§ 364. *The Gallican Church—Gallican Liberties.*

(*Picot*), Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France pendant le XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1824, 2 vols.; German, by *Raess* and *Weis*, Frkft., 1829, 2 vols. *Ranke*, Hist. of France during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Vols. III. and IV. (Complete Works, Vols. X.-XIII.)

During the latter half of the preceding Epoch the Church of France had been at once more active and more agitated than that of

[1] Joseph II., writing to Catharine of Russia, who had expressed some anxiety on account of the presence of Pius VI. in Vienna, said: "In reality, the Pope has accomplished nothing. He was even obliged to draw up in my favour a written document, expressing his satisfaction with the condition in which he found my own religion and that of my subjects." (*Von Arneth*, The Correspondence of Joseph II. with Catharine of Russia, Vienna, 1869).

any other country; and on this account she is before the world more conspicuously than any other during the interval of time of which we are now about to treat, when events that had been long preparing were producing their legitimate consequences.

Louis XIV. had employed systematic violence and crafty political methods against the Church, but more directly against her Head.[1] He seemed to think that by using arbitrary measures to crush the already enfeebled power of the Pope he could the more effectually exalt his own. In speaking of the pontificate of Innocent XI., we noticed the pretensions of the French king concerning the *Right of Regalia*. The celebrated *Declaration* of the French clergy in the *Four Articles* of 1682, said to have been drawn up by *Bossuet*,[2] was the outcome of this controversy between the Pope and the king. These articles declare:—

I. That to St. Peter and to his successors, and even to the Church herself, God gave power only in things spiritual and pertaining to everlasting life; but not in things civil or temporal; for He said: "My kingdom is not of this world;" and again: "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's;" and hence the truth of this saying of the Apostles: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but from God, and those that are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Hence, in temporal concerns, kings and rulers are, *by ordinance of God*, subject to no power of the Church; neither can they be deposed, either directly or indirectly, by the authority of the Keys, nor can their subjects be freed from their allegiance, their obedience, and their sworn promise of fidelity. That this teaching, inasmuch as it is necessary to the preservation of the public peace, beneficial alike to Church and State, and in harmony with the word of God, the tradition of the Fathers, and the examples of the Saints, should by no means be given up.

II. That the fulness of Spiritual power possessed by the Apostolic See and by the Successors of St. Peter, the Vicars of Jesus Christ, is such that it does not invalidate or destroy the force of the Decrees contained in the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Holy Œcumenical Synod of Constance "*On the Authority of General Councils*," which were approved by the Apostolic See, confirmed by the usage of the whole Church and of the Roman Pontiffs themselves, and at all times maintained by the Gallican Church; and that the Gallican Church does not agree with those who weaken the force of these Decrees by claiming that they are of doubtful authority and wanting in approbation, or who restrict their application to a period of schism, such as existed at the time of the Council.

III. That, therefore, the use of the Apostolic power is to be restricted by the Canons, enacted by the Spirit of God, and made sacred by reverence of the whole world; that the rules, customs, and institutions of the Gallican Kingdom and Church continue in full force; that the bounds set up by the Fathers remain inviolate; and that the Holy See owes it to its own dignity to see that the statutes and customs established by this same See, and confirmed by the consent of the churches, shall, as is becoming, subsist unchanged.

IV. That, while in questions of faith the Supreme Pontiff has the chief part, and his decrees are binding upon each and every church, his judgment is not irreversible (*irréformable*), unless it shall have been confirmed by the consent of the Church.

---

[1] *Lacretelle*, Histoire de France au XVIIIe siècle. (Germ. by *Sander*, Brl., 1810, 2 vols.

[2] Printed in *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., pp. 127, 128. *Litta* (Cardinal), Lettres sur les soi-disant quatre articles du clergé de France, avec une introduction par Martin de Noirlieu; tr. fr. the French into Germ., by *Robiano* (with preface), Münster, 1844. **Philips*, C. L., Vol. III., pp. 339-365.

Besides these Four Articles, usually called the "*Liberties* of the Gallican Church," but more appropriately the "*Slaveries*," certain other claims were made, as, for instance, the *Appellatio tanquam ab abusu, placetum regium*, etc. The great blunder committed by this Gallican Assembly was the making of "*general theorems*, which were more or less at variance with the practice of the Church, and whose discussion ought to have been confined to the Schools, the *matter of conciliar enactments*, when there was no sufficient cause for so doing; thus giving the civil power an excuse for enforcing them and making them part of the fundamental law of the State." The French bishops turned a deaf ear to the voice of *Fenelon*, who warned them that "it was from the *Civil* Power, and not from Rome, that encroachments and usurpations were in the future to come; that in matter of fact the king was now more Head of the Gallican Church than the Pope himself; that the king's authority had been transferred to secular judges; and that bishops were now ruled by *laymen*." The French bishops closed their eyes to the uniform teaching of historical precedents, which proved indisputably that every church separating itself from the spiritual Head of the Hierarchy had of necessity gone to ruin. However, it is not necessary to question here the motives by which the author of the "Declaration" and his party were inspired.

Bossuet, writing to an intimate friend, gives this explanation of his conduct: "I had always thought," he said, "that it would be well to so explain the authority of the Holy See, that while compromising none of its sacred rights, those who fear rather than love it, and even heretics and all its adversaries, might be brought to regard it with sentiments of tender respect. The Holy See has lost absolutely nothing by the Declaration of France, for the Ultramontanes themselves allow that in the instance in which France sets a Council above the Pope, he might be proceeded against in another way, as, for example, by declaring that he had forfeited the Papacy. Hence, it is not so much the thing itself that is in question as the way in which it is to be done." Taking this fallacious principle as the basis of his argument, Bossuet wrote a "Defence of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy," upon which he was engaged for thirty years of his life, and which was indiscreetly published five-and-twenty years after his death.

It is, nevertheless, evident both from the peculiar way in which these Articles were drawn up, and from the application made of them by numerous ecclesiastics, and particularly by the parliaments, that they did contain the germ of *schismatical tendencies*, inasmuch as they were pressed into service whenever a stand was to be made against the Holy Apostolic See, or whenever it was thought expedient to refuse obedience to its decrees. They were also dangerous, in that they flattered the vanity of the "great nation" *by holding France up to the admiration of the world as the land of ecclesiastical freedom, and the Gallican Church as the true Catholic model for all other churches.*

The leading spirits of the so-called *reformatory synods* seemed to

forget that ever since the days of *St. Irenæus* the Gallican Church had esteemed it a privilege and a glory to defend the rights of the Holy See. The more far-seeing of the French bishops, with Fenelon at their head, rightly judged that these supposed "Liberties" would in the long run prove to be, what the event verified, so many "*Slaveries.*" This has been but recently admitted by *Pressensé*, a Protestant writer. "Gallicanism," he says, "made the Church the handmaid of the State; and its famous *Liberties* were but liberties taken by the *King* to govern in both the ecclesiastical and civil domains."[1] The Articles of the Declaration of 1682 have been very fairly discussed by *Thomassin*, the Oratorian;[2] and still more recently and no less fairly by *Walter* and *Charles Gérin*.[3]

§ 365. *Jansenism—Quesnel—Schism of Utrecht.*

Leydecker, Historiæ Jansenismi, libb. VI., Traj. ad Rhen., 1695. *Luchesini*, Hist. polem. Jans., Rom., 1711, 3 T. Abrége hist. des détours et des variat. du Jans. (place ?), 1739, 4to. †*Thom. du Fossé*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal, Col., 1739. *Nicole Fontaine*, under the same title, Colog. (Utrecht), 1738. (*Dom. de Colonia*, Jesuit), Dictionnaire des livres qui favorisent le Jansénisme Antv., 1756, 4 T. *Reuchlin*, Hist. of Port-Royal, Hamburg, 1839 sq., 2 vols. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Journal of Theology, Vol. II., pp. 148-190; also "*Port-Royal* and Jansenism" (*Würzburg*, Friend of Religion, 1845, April, nros. 26-28).

A controversy still more disastrous, both in its influence upon the people and in its general consequences, was that on Jansenism. Its origin has been already noticed.[4] After the five propositions of the "*Augustinus*" of Jansenius had been condemned, his partisans raised the questions:[5] "Is the Church really infallible in determining a question of *fact;* for example, the sense of a book? Is not her infallibility restricted to dogmatic truth?" Hence arose *the famous distinction of fact and right;* and it was said, in point of *right*, the five propositions were justly condemned, but in point of *fact* they were not contained in the book of Jansenius, at least in the *sense* in which they were condemned. The most eminent champions of Jansenism at this time were *Anthony Arnauld*,[6] *Nicole*, and the profound and celebrated *Pascal*,[7] all of whom were the avowed enemies of the Jesuits. The

[1] *Bossuet*, Defensio declarationis Cleri Gallicani, Luxemb. (Gen.) 1730 (Œuvres., nouv. éd. Par., 1836, 4 T. IX.); *Du Pin*, De pot. eccl. et temp. s. declaratio cleri gallic., Vind., 1776, 4to; Mog., 1788, 4to. *Fénélon*, De summi Pontificis auctoritate diss. (œuvres. nouv. éd. Par., 1838, T. I.); his sentiment, given above, is found in ch. 45. *Koehler*, Hist. Exposition of the Declaration drawn up by the Gallican Clergy, Hadamar and Coblenz, 1815. Cf. *The Catholic*, The Gallican Liberties and French Learning, three articles of the year 1865, Vol. I. *Pressensé*, Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire, etc.

[2] In his celebrated work, De nova et antiqua Eccles. disciplina, etc; see Vol. I., p. 8, note 4.

[3] *Walter*, Canon Law, 13th ed., § 114, pp. 270-273. *Chas. Gérin*, Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée du clergé de France de 1682, 2ème ed., Paris, 1870. (Tr.)

[4] Vide supra, § 351, Vol. 3, p. 485 sq.

[5] (*Du-Mas*), Hist. des cinq propos. de Jans.; see Vol. 3, p. 486, note 1. *Robbe*, Dissert. de Jansenismo (tractatus de gratia, T. II.), Par., 1780.

[6] Œuvres complètes d'Arnaud, Lausanne, 1775-1783, 48 vols., 4to.

[7] Lettres provinciales, Paris, 1656, 12mo, and frequently; Lemgo, 1774, 3 vols. La

tactics of the Jansenists were very unlike those of Bajus, and in this consisted much of the insidious danger of Jansenism; for, while the latter addressed himself to a comparatively small number of learned and discriminating persons, the former aimed at influencing the masses, and for this purpose began at once to preach a doctrine of mysticism, which they held was the only *true theology* and *morality*, and contained the true *liberal* view of both ecclesiastical and political matters. Neither the method they adopted nor the teaching they propagated was wholly new; they had both been mapped out with sufficient accuracy and clearness in the Introduction to the *Second* Book of Jansenius' "*Augustinus*." The Cistercian Convent of nuns of *Port-Royal-des-Champs*, near Versailles, a branch of which was established in Paris, in 1638, and was known under the name of *Port-Royal-de-Paris*, was the great centre of the Jansenistic movement. Its abbess was the famous *Angélique Arnauld*, the sister of the brothers Arnauld, and the pupil of the Abbot of St. Cyran. St. Francis de Sales, who had been her confessor, described her as a soul naturally vivacious, and constantly running into some extravagance. Fascinated by the new and mystical teachings of St. Cyran, she began to disseminate them among the other members of the convent, where they were calculated to do much harm, for the community had acquired a deservedly high reputation for strict observance of Rule and earnest piety. Having once put themselves in sympathy with the Jansenists, the nuns were encouraged to persevere in the course upon which they had entered, by the establishment at Port-Royal-des-Champs of an association of hermits, consisting of *Anthony Arnauld* and other well-known Port-Royalists, whose *penitential zeal was somewhat fantastic*, and who, acting on the counsels of St. Cyran, dissuaded from frequent Communion, on the ground that a less frequent reception *would beget a habit of hungering for the Sacrament.*

To meet the subtle distinctions and wretched shifts by which the Jansenists sought to escape censure, Alexander VII. published the bull *Ad Sacram*, in which, besides confirming the bull *Cum occasione* of his predecessor, he stated specifically that the five propositions were in matter of fact contained in the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, and had been condemned in the sense in which they were there found. By the request of the French bishops, the Pope sent at the same time a "*Formulary*," which all the clergy were required to subscribe without equivocation or reservation (1665). At the request of the Archbishop of Paris, *Bossuet* wrote to the inmates of Port-Royal, stating clearly the point at issue, and recommending obedience. "In all these

Vie de Pascal, par sa sœur Mme. *Périer* and *Bossut* (not Bossuet), Discours sur la vie et les ouvrages de Pascal (Œuvres de Pascal, 1670, 1779, 1819, also *Bossut*, Hist. des Mathématiques; tr. into Germ. by *Reiner*, Hamburg, 1804, Vol. II.) Pensées, fragments et lettres publiés par *P. Faugère*, Paris, 1844, 2 vols. (This edition gives the Pensées in their original shape). *Herman Reuchlin*, Pascal, His Life and the Spirit of His Writings, Stuttg., 1840 (is partial). *Neander*, On the Historical Importance of the *Pensées* of Pascal, Berlin, 1847. *Dreydorf*, The Life and Struggles of Pascal, Lps., 1870.

formulas of faith," he wrote substantially, "in which the authority of the Church is brought face to face with *facts*, it has never been found necessary to employ this distinction. The Church has often been required to examine and decide upon facts; as, for example, has such a bishop taught such an error? or is such an error found in such a book? Shorn of this right, it would be impossible for her to defend herself against false teaching. There is no instance in which the Church has waited until heresiarchs and their partisans have been pleased to come forward and confess themselves the authors of the errors with which they were charged. To how many and how great dangers would she not lay herself open should she suspend the effect of her decisions upon heretics and their works until the truth of the alleged facts would be candidly avowed by the heretics themselves? *Fenelon* expressed himself in a similar sense some time later.[1] Recognizing the wisdom of the advice given by men so eminent, the bishops of the opposition consented, during the pontificate of Clement IX., to subscribe the *Formulary*, not indeed unreservedly and with full assent, but in the sense of what was called *respectful silence*, or, that while not believing they would remain quiet.

At the opening of the eighteenth century the controversy grew more spirited and acrimonious. In the year 1702, while the clergy were coming forward freely to sign the Formulary, the celebrated *Case of conscience* made its appearance. In this an ecclesiastic, who had not been able to bring himself to believe that the Pope was infallible in deciding questions of *fact*, and had set his name to the Formulary with a corresponding mental restriction, was supposed to be in a dying condition and greatly troubled in his conscience. The confessor cannot see his way clear, and puts the question: Can this man be absolved? Nearly all the doctors of the Sorbonne, besides many others, held that he could. Cardinal Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, commanded them to retract the opinion, which most of them did, but others refused to do. Hereupon Clement XI. published (1705) his bull, *Vineam Domini*, in which, while reaffirming the teaching set forth in that of Alexander VII., he declared that the "*respectful silence*" was not sufficient for absolution in the instance given in the *Case of Conscience*, and that it was necessary to put aside all doubt as to the Pope's infallibility in deciding questions involving dogmatic facts. The bull was accepted by both the clergy and parliament. The *Port-Royalists* of the convent near Versailles dearly atoned for their course in qualifying the acceptance of the Formulary and in resisting all appeals to return to Catholic obedience. In 1709, the convent was suppressed, the nuns distributed among the other Orders throughout France, and, in 1710, by order of the king, the building itself was *demolished*,[2] an extreme measure, which many

[1] Correspondance de Fénélon, Paris, 1827, 3 T. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. V., p. 489 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12, art. Jansénius, and Jansénisme.

[2] Mémoires sur la destruction de Port-Roy. des Champs, 1711, *Sainte-Beuve*, Port-Royal, Paris, 1840 sq., 2 T., of which a second edition (very spiteful) appeared.

traced to the influence of Father *Le Tellier*, a Jesuit, and the king's confessor.

Strange to say, the controversy had not yet reached its full stature, to which, however, it was now brought by *Quesnel*, a French Oratorian. The scientific labours of Quesnel, and particularly his edition of the works of Leo the Great, preceded by some learned dissertations of his own, had fairly entitled him to the gratitude of all Catholics. Among the Oratorians the very salutary custom prevails of meditating daily upon certain passages of Holy Writ; and Quesnel, who had been very assiduous in this holy exercise, published between the years 1671 and 1687, his *Moral Reflections* on the whole of the New Testament.[1] A deep religious spirit, devotional warmth and earnestness, and great power and grasp of thought pervaded the work throughout. It produced a marked influence, and was constantly to be seen in the hands of devout Christians. Cardinal Noailles, then Bishop of Châlons, gave it his approbation, and commended it to the faithful in a Pastoral, published in 1685. Other prelates followed his example, and Clement XI. himself expressed the belief that there was probably not an ecclesiastic in Italy capable of producing such a work. When, however, some of the most learned men in France, after a close and conscientious examination of the edition of the *Moral Reflections* issued in the year 1693, expressed their disapproval of the work on the ground that it contained Jansenistic errors, Clement appointed a commission, composed not of Jesuits, the avowed enemies of the Jansenists, but of Dominicans, whose opinions on the points under consideration differed widely from those of the disciples of Ignatius, and charged this body to look carefully through the book, and report their judgment to him. After long and careful consideration, the Pope published the bull *Unigenitus* (1713), condemning one hundred and one propositions contained in the Moral Reflections.[2] It may be urged that the fact that the scope of Quesnel's book was to treat of pious meditation, of aspirations and forms of prayer, and not of dogmatic distinctions, stated with scientific accuracy, was not sufficiently taken into account. But it may be answered that in religious meditations, the aim of which is to foster a spirit of piety, we have a right to expect that the dogmatic propositions that underlie them, and upon which they are built, shall be luminous and established beyond all manner of doubt. This was all the more true in Quesnel's case, because having, after the death of Arnauld, become the recognized leader of the Jansenists (1694), he reproduced precisely all their errors on *free-will* and *grace*, teaching that grace is all-powerful and acts irresistibly, thus, like Jansenius, utterly destroying free-will. He concluded quite rigorously: "If God wishes to save the creature, saved he will infallibly be; and hence, if the creature be lost, it is because God would have it so."

[1] Le Nouv. Testam. en françois avec des réflexions morales, Par., 1687, and frequently. *Huth*, Ch. H., of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 245-322.

[2] These propositions are, besides the Bullarium, found in Latin, also in the *Leipzig* stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, pp. 283-291; in Latin and German in *Smets'* edition.

Quesnel also gave expression to some *ideas on the Church* and her discipline, whose drift was, to say the least, *suspicious*,[1] maintaining, for example, that a person considering himself unjustly excommunicated was not cut off from holding friendly relations with God; for, though separated from the visible, he was not from the invisible body of the Church. He also held that all Christians, not excluding women and young children, should be allowed to read the Bible without any sort of restriction, else the children of light would be shut out from the very source of light.

But if Quesnel outraged the teaching of the Church, it must be frankly confessed that he was not the only participant in the controversy who did so. After the appearance of the bull *Unigenitus*, Cardinal Noailles, now *Archbishop of Paris* (from 1695 to 1729), forbade the Catholics of his diocese to read the Moral Reflections; but, strange to say, at an assembly of the French Clergy, convened by royal order in 1714, he objected to receiving the bull *Unigenitus* without qualification. Unable to get more than seven bishops of the assembly to side with him, he was defeated, but not silenced. He published a circular over his own name, in which, while again condemning the Moral Reflections, he forbade those within his jurisdiction, under penalty of suspension, to receive the dogmatic decisions of the Holy See on the same subject. When the question as to whether the bull should be registered by the Sorbonne was put to the vote, the affirmative decision was carried, but only by a simple majority.

With a view to allay popular feeling, daily growing more threatening, Louis XIV. conceived the design of convoking a national council, which his death in 1715 prevented him from carrying into effect. The worthless and immoral *Philip, Duke of Orleans*, held the regency during the minority of the young king, *Louis XV.*, when the Jansenists again rallied in all their force. Four bishops appealed from the bull *Unigenitus* to an Œcumenical Council. These were soon joined by one hundred and six doctors of the Sorbonne and by Cardinal Noailles, and, under the name of *Appellants*,[2] rapidly grew into a powerful and formidable party. These alarming indications of revolt against the authority of the Holy See decided the Pope to publish (1718) the unusually severe bull *Pastoralis officii*, declaring that anyone, be he cardinal or bishop, refusing to accept the constitution *Unigenitus* thereby ceased to be of the members of the Church. The Appellants protested, and Cardinal Noailles, who had been so peremptorily reminded of his duty instead of obeying the Holy See, used the authority of his name and the influence of his family to

[1] *Huth*, Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 258 sq., and 279 sq. Cf. *Renati Jos. Dubois*, Collectio nova actor. publicor. constitut. Clementinæ *Unigenitus*, Lugd. Batav., 1725. *C. M. Pfaff*, Acta publica const. *Unigenitus*, Tueb., 1728. Add to these: Errores et synopsis vitæ Paschasii Quesnel, cujus 101 propositiones constitutione *Unigenitus* per Ecclesiam damnatæ, etc.; accedunt instrumenta publicationum, etc., Antv., 1717, 12mo.

[2] The two parties went under the names of *Constitutionalists* and *Anti-Constitutionalits*; also of *Acceptants* and *Recusants*, according as they received or rejected the Papal *Constitution*. (Tr.)

strengthen the hands of its opponents. Thus, in 1720, while ostensibly promoting measures of peace, he was privately counselling resistance, a shifty policy, which he carried on until the year 1728, when he finally consented to receive the bull *Unigenitus*, without qualification or limitation, and his example was followed by the greater number of the *Appellant* bishops. The bishops of *Montpellier*, *Auxerre*, *Troyes*, *Senez*, *Metz*, *Mâcon*, *Tréguier*, *Pamiers*, and *Castres* alone held out, preferring exile to submission.

As is the case with all sects, the Jansenists now openly professed the most deplorable errors, lost all their former reserve and discretion, and sank in the estimation of the people. Their ascetical practices degenerated into fanaticism, and their unbelief was hardly distinguishable from atheism. Failing to regain public esteem by intrigue, they resorted to pretended miracles. Reports were widely circulated of numerous cures that were said to be daily taking place in the cemetery of St. Médard, at the tomb of the *deacon*, *Francis Pâris*, who in life had been a zealous *Appellant* († 1727).[1] To prove the sanctity of the deacon and the justness of his cause, a number of frenzied devotees would go into frantic convulsions and pretended ecstacies before the multitude. From having been extravagant they now became ridiculous; and this sect, which had so brilliant an opening, had, like every other, a farcical close, confirming once more the truth of the French proverb "*ridicule tue;*" and those who, as Voltaire said, buried Jansenism in the grave of the deacon Francis, expired as "*Convulsionaries.*" The cemetery was closed by royal order,[2] but the convulsions continued in private houses. At length *De Beaumont*, Archbishop of Paris (from 1746), prescribed strict rules for the guidance of his clergy in dealing with Jansenists, forbidding them to give the Sacraments to anyone lying sick, who was not able to produce a certificate from his parish priest stating that he had been to confession. The measure was rendered necessary, because the *Appellants* were in the habit of going privately to their own confessors. The parliament took cognizance of the affair, citing the archbishop before its tribunal (1752). The prelate protested, denying the competency of the Court; and the king, making the cause of the clergy his own, dissolved the parliament, and sent several of its members into exile. The pressure of circumstances obliged the king to recall them in 1754, when a violent reaction set in in favour of giving the Sacraments to the *Appellants*, and the archbishop, refusing to yield, was in his turn banished from Paris. The controversy was still quietly and languidly proceeding, when *Clement XIV.*, taking the matter in

[1] Vie de M. François de Paris, Utr., 1729, and frequently. Relation des miracles de St. François de Par. avec un abrégé de sa vie, Brux., 1731. *Montgeron*, La Vérité des miracles du diacre Pâris (Par., 1737), Col., 1845 sq., 3 T., 4to. *Mosheim*, Diss. ad h. e., T., II., p. 307 sq. *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Pt. I., pp. 133-148.

[2] Whereupon a wit wrote the following epigram:—

De par le roi; défense à Dieu
De faire miracles en ce lieu. (Tr.).

hand, decided that the instructions of the archbishop should be rigorously carried out, but only in the case of those whose opposition to the bull *Unigenitus* was *notorious*. One of the saddest consequences of this conflict was the interference of the State in the affairs of the Church, thus setting up a precedent which gave colour to the subsequent policy of the Government.

The Jansenistic controversy was carried on with still more vehemence in the *Netherlands*, where it was productive of still more disastrous controversies, assuming there the character of an actual schism.[1] The metropolitan see of *Utrecht*, and the suffragan sees of Haarlem, Leeuwarden, Deventer, Groningen, and Middelburg, the latter all founded by King Philip II., had been abolished and their estates confiscated, in consequence of the religious and political troubles existing between Spain and the Netherlands;[2] but, in spite of these untoward circumstances, the number of Catholics still remaining and subject to the authority of the Vicar Apostolic was considerable. Gregory XIII. appointed *Sasbold Vismer*, Nuncio to Cologne, Vicar Apostolic, first of the diocese of Utrecht and subsequently of all the Low Countries. He was consecrated at Rome, in 1602, by *Clement VIII.*, under the title of Archbishop of Philippi *in partibus infidelium*, and sent back to Utrecht with revocable jurisdiction. He was succeeded by *Philip Roven*, under the same title. This prelate did his best to preserve the Chapter of Utrecht, which was slowly losing its members, by establishing a kind of *collegiate* institution, composed of the dispersed parish priests whom he had there gathered about him. Utrecht was then the chief asylum of the Jansenists, and there they continued to find protection and sympathy until the close of the seventeenth century, when the Vicar Apostolic, *Peter Kodde*, Archbishop of Sebaste (since 1688), openly avowed himself their friend. He was in consequence suspended from the exercise of his jurisdiction by Clement XI., and *Peter van Kock* (1702) appointed in his room under the name of Provicar. But neither the ministrations of Van Kock nor those of his successors, *Daemen*, Bishop of Adrianople (from 1707), and *Van Bylevelt*, were very effective, owing to the obstructions the Jansenists were constantly throwing in the way of their exercise. *Quesnel* himself withdrew to Amsterdam in 1703, where he continued to write in favour of Jansenism; and after his death, in 1719, Petitpied, Faulu, and others took his place, and kept up a constant intercourse with the Jansenists in France.

The Dutch Government, whose interests were hostile to those of the Holy See, looked with favour upon, and at times actively promoted, the insidious plans of the Jansenists. Thus were the French Deacon *Boullenois* (1716) and *Dominic Varlet*, titular Bishop of Babylon, brought to Holland. Whatever of disorder was left undone was

[1] *Hoynk van Papendrecht*, Hist. de rebus eccl. Ultraject., Col., 1725. **Mozzi*, Storia delle revoluzioni della chiesa d'Utrecht, Ven., 1787, 3 vols. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 504 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 24, p. 422 sq.

[2] See § 333.

completed by the latter. Though suspended from the exercise of his functions, and acting in the face of a protest from Rome, he consecrated *Cornelius Steenoven*, who had been elected, in 1723, by a *pretended chapter* of Utrecht, archbishop of that city. Varlet repeated the sacrilegious act several times after the death of Steenoven, and finally, in 1742, Archbishop *Meindarts* revived the bishoprics of Haarlem (1742) and Deventer (1752), thus preventing the extinction of the line of schismatical bishops. He held a synod in Utrecht in 1763, the acts of which he sent to Rome. Although many efforts have been made to close this schism, it endures to our own day, because the church of Utrecht stubbornly refuses to receive the bull *Unigenitus*. It, however, recognizes the primacy of the Holy See, and each bishop, when elected, notifies the Pope, professes submission to Rome, and requests to have his election confirmed. But the Popes have uniformly declined to receive any overtures, except on condition of the acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*, and as a rule have declared the bishops-elect excommunicated.[1] The schismatics number about four thousand five hundred souls, scattered through twenty-five parishes in the dioceses of Utrecht and Haarlem. The Bishop of Deventer, who resides at Rotterdam, and has the title of Pastor of the Archdiocese of Utrecht, enjoys a sinecure, having no subjects. Such is the precarious existence which this Jansenist and Ultra-Gallican schism continues to drag out, though in possession of all the church property that had been rescued from the cupidity of the Reformers, and accumulated in later years by the economy of the Catholics.

§ 366. *Quietism—Molinos—Madame Guyon.*

Quietism in France (Tueb. Theolog. Quarterly, 1856, two articles).

While Jansenism was still occupying the thoughts of men, and unsettling their convictions, new errors, drawing life from the same source, engaged the attention of theologians. Originating like Jansenism, in the absence of a true spirit of interior life, they became notorious only after having encountered a lively opposition. The theologians of the Middle Ages had not unfrequently made the body of religious teaching little more than an elaborate system of dry formulas and barren definitions, never treating morals except as the subject-matter of a repulsive casuistry. As was natural, the reaction against so cold and unsympathetic a system produced a false and fanatical enthusiasm that sometimes nearly unseated the reason. And what took place in the Middle Ages was repeated under analogous conditions in the seventeenth century. *Michael Molinos*, who was chiefly instrumental in setting this mystical reaction in motion, was born (1627) in the neighbourhood of Saragossa, in Spain; that is to say, in the land where side by side with such marvels of true mysticism

[1] *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Pt. VI., p. 82 sq.; pp. 165-174; pp. 489-538. *Tueb. Quart.*, 1826, nro. 3, p. 178 sq.

as St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, and Louis of Granada, there existed extravagant visionaries and fanatical antinomists. Molinos, having completed his studies at Coimbra and Pampeluna, went, in 1669, to reside in Rome, where persons of the highest rank and sincerest piety placed themselves under his spiritual direction. He shortly published a work entitled the *Spiritual Guide*, which for many years was very favourably received, and was translated from the original Spanish into both French and Italian.[1] The dangerous spirit that pervaded the book soon became manifest. Its most assiduous readers began to form little gatherings for themselves, to develop, together with a mystical, a pietistical tendency, and to use objectionable forms of prayer. The famous preacher, *Paul Segneri*, was the first to call public attention to the seductive errors it contained (*Concordantia laboris cum quiete in oratione*), and a more critical examination of its contents only confirmed the truth of his charges. Its author was in consequence pursued with rigorous severity until he had done penance and retracted his errors, which he did in 1687, when, though absolved, he was kept confined in a Dominican convent until his death, in 1696.

At the instance of Father la Chaise, confessor to Louis XIV., Innocent XI. condemned sixty-eight propositions contained in Molinos' book. Although Cardinal Cibo, writing in the name of the Inquisition, had, as early as February 15, 1687, addressed a circular letter to all the prelates and princes of the Catholic Church, warning them against the dangerous and insidious character of Molinos' errors, the number of his partisans went on steadily increasing. They were known as *Quietists* and their errors as *Quietism*, because Molinos held that for one to be perfect the soul must be quiet, neither reasoning, sympathising, nor exercising any faculty whatever, the most exalted state of the spiritual life being that in which one is wholly oblivious of self, yet wholly occupied with God. In order that the soul return to its principle and the source of its being, it must annihilate itself, be changed, transformed, and divinized. But to accomplish this the exercise of the mental faculties must cease, the soul must be passive, incapable of meditating or of even having a good thought of God Himself. Its sole function is to passively receive the infused light of heaven, the accompaniment of a purely inactive state of contemplation.

In reply it was said that, according to this theory, the soul would be in such a state of absolute indifference that it would no longer give itself any concern about either heaven or hell, or any of the dogmatic teachings of the Church; and that being thus lifted above the body by a supernatural union with God, it would forego the practice of the necessary works of charity, and in the end lapse into sen-

[1] *Guida spirituale*, Rom., 1681; in Spanish as early as 1675; in Latin by *Franke*, 1687; in German by *Arnold*, 1699. Recueil des div. pièces concernant le Quiétisme, Amst., 1688. Conf. *Weissmann*, H. e., Pt. II., p. 541. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VII., pp. 213-218; Fr. tr., Vol. 15, p. 202 sq.

suality; for so completely would it be absorbed in God, that it would wholly disregard the functions of corporeal sense; and the criminal movements of the sensitive soul and the criminal actions of the bodily senses and members would therefore be entirely independent of it in this state of contemplative repose. Hence, from this sublime state of contemplation, in which all external things would be indifferent to the soul, there would be but one step to fatally lax principles in morals.

That these conclusions were fairly deducible from his system, Molinos could not deny. Moreover, Quietism, by identifying the Creator with the creature, or by what Molinos called *deification*, through a true and perfect annihilation of self, led directly to pantheism.

About the same time, the works of the blind *Francis Malavale*, of Marseilles, and those of Abbé *d'Estival* and the *Barnabite Lacombe* (*Analysis orationis*), but particularly those of *Jeanne de la Motte Guyon*, a woman of deep and sincere piety, of distinguished talent, and of such purity of life that not even her most malignant enemies dared to asperse her character,[1] were suspected of containing Quietistic errors and of having a strong Quietistic tendency. Born at Montargis, in France, April 13, 1648, of an ancient French family, and educated in several convents, Madame Guyon early manifested a taste for a contemplative life. She was led by reading the works of *St. Francis de Sales* to cultivate a habit of assiduous prayer, which she broke off after a time to give herself up to the seductive attractions of the world, to which she was drawn by a consciousness of her extraordinary beauty. Having contracted at the age of sixteen a marriage, which proved an unhappy one, she began to repine; and longing for comfort and peace of soul, she again resumed the pious practices and close intercourse with God which she had left off when drawn away by the charm of a worldly life. Left a widow at the age of twenty-five, she was now free to prosecute her pious wishes, and in the year 1681 repaired to Gex, where she entered an establishment specially intended for recent converts, over which the Bishop of Geneva had set the Barnabite *Father Lacombe*, who, it seems, instead of discreetly checking the extravagancies of his new charge, showed a disposition to indulge them. Here she devoted herself enthusiastically to ascetical exercises, and, as she fancied, passed through the three stages designated by the Mystics as *absolute indifference*, *spiritual death*, and *interior renewal*. She professed a resolution of giving herself unreservedly to the service of God, but her idea of spiritual life was so false and fantastic that she, together with Father Lacombe, was banished from Geneva. She shortly after entered the Ursuline convent at Thonon, where she was seized with an irresistible impulse to

[1] La vie de Mad. de la *Motte Guyon*, écrite par elle-même, Col., 1720, 3 T., 12mo, and Berlin, 1826 (Germ. by *Montenglaut*, Brl., 1826, 3 pts.) La Bible de Mme. *Guyon*, Cologne (Amsterd.), 1715 sq., 20 T. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. IV., pp. 836-839; Fr. tr., Vol. 10, pp. 229-233. Her Complete Works comprise 39 vols.; they were published by Poiret, Cologne (Amsterdam), 1715, and by Du Joit, Mambrini, 1790, 40 vols.

give her ideas to the world, and accordingly wrote a number of treatises, among which are the following: *A Short and Easy Method of Prayer; Spiritual Torrents; Mystical Works;* and *Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures.* From Thonon Madame Guyon went to Paris, where complaints against the dangerous character of her writings brought her under the notice of the archbishop, and on the 29th of January, 1688, she was taken into custody, and shut up in the Convent of the Visitation, but regained her liberty some time later, at the instance of Madame de Maintenon. Lacombe had also been arrested in October, 1687, and obstinately refusing to retract what was objectionable in his *Analysis fidei*, was banished the city, and died out of his mind at Charenton in 1699.

The most objectionable of the tenets of Madame Guyon, and that which appears to have been the *underlying principle* of her teaching, was her theory of self-abnegation. Pure love of God, she said, is so entirely disinterested that it takes no thought of self, puts out of sight all hope of reward and fear of punishment, and makes no account even of salvation. God is loved solely because He is most worthy of love This love is so completely its own reward that the soul in the enjoyment of it would, were such God's will, consent to be eternally damned.

In the year 1694 the Archbishop of Paris and the Bishop of Chartres condemned her writings; and in the same year a Commission, whose members, consisting of the Bishops of Meaux and Châlons and M. Tronson, the Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, were designated by Fenelon, who himself was the fourth member, was appointed by royal order to examine her works. The sessions took place at Issy, the country-house attached to the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and continued into the year 1695. *Bossuet* presided, but deferred in important matters to M. Tronson, who was a man of great learning and sound judgment.[1] The Commission published as the result of its labours an instrument of Thirty-four Articles, giving a clear and full exposition of true and false mysticism. These Madame Guyon humbly subscribed, solemnly protesting that it was never her intention to pen a line contrary to Catholic doctrine. Bossuet expressed himself satisfied, and gave her a certificate to this effect. It was thought that there was now an end of the controversy on Quietism, which we shall presently see was not the fact. Madame Guyon, secretly quitting her asylum at Meaux, where she had remained during the sitting of the Commission at Issy, again went forth, proclaiming her teachings and exhibiting Bossuet's testimonial as a proof of their orthodoxy. She was again placed under arrest and imprisoned, and having finally obtained her freedom, was exiled to *Blois*, where she died a holy and edifying death, June 9, 1717.[2]

She would certainly never have been so well known as she is had

[1] Abbé *Rohrbacher*, Ch. H., Bk., 88, passim. (Tr).
[2] Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la théologie Catholiqu , art. "Guyon." (Tr.)

it not been for *Fenelon's* relations to her. This pious and celebrated man, believing firmly in the virtue of Madame Guyon and the purity of her love of God, came forward from motives of the most disinterested charity to see that justice was done her. As a refutation of her principles, Bossuet wrote a work *On the States of Prayer* (*Sur les états d'oraison*), to which he requested Fenelon to give his approval. This the latter declined to do, believing the censures of Bossuet to be too severe on the writings of Madame Guyon. From that moment these two great men were estranged, and a controversy ensued, which, painful enough under any circumstances, was made doubly so by the bitterness displayed by the contestants, and at the close of which the extraordinary example of humility given by Fenelon revealed the true nobility and grandeur of his character. Wishing also to give a true exposition of mysticism, without, however, exhibiting the opinions of Madame Guyon in so unfavourable a light as Bossuet had done, he wrote his *Explanations of the Maxims of the Saints in Relation to Interior Life* (1697), giving his views, which were attractive rather than solid, on pure and disinterested love.[1] Bossuet, fearing the influence of this work would be dangerous in the measure in which the virtue of Fenelon was exalted, the esteem in which he was held great, and the influence he exerted powerful; and conscious that the work gave proof that there the splendid intellect of its author was at its best, at once threw himself fully into the controversy, and in combating false mysticism was not always careful to avoid violating the precepts of the true. Fenelon, who was not in favour at court, was ordered to submit his book to an ecclesiastical tribunal, of which Bossuet was a member; but declining, on the ground that the latter had prejudged the case, was permitted by the king to refer the whole cause to the decision of the Holy See. Pope Innocent XII. appointed a Commission, consisting of ten members, who, after having had the matter in hand for an entire year, in the course of which they held sixty-four protracted sessions, and after innumerable delays, difficulties, and doubts, condemned (March 12, 1699) in general terms the *Maxims of the Saints*, selecting out of the work, however, twenty-three propositions for special notes of censure, some of which were characterized as scandalous, others as dangerous, others as erroneous, and others again as mischievous in practice. The Pope contrived to break the force of so severe a blow, dealt at a bishop so deservedly esteemed, by declaring that "*Fenelon* had erred by the excess of his love of God, but *Bossuet* by lack of love for his neighbour." The sentence reached Fenelon on the 25th of March, just as he was about to go into the pulpit of his cathedral to preach. After reading it aloud to the congregation, he besought his friends, with tears in his eyes, no longer

[1] Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure, Paris, 1697. *Fénélon*, Lettre (s) à M. de Meaux en réponse aux divers écrits ou mémoires sur le livre des Maximes, etc.—Sur le Quiétisme. (Œuvres; nouv. edit., Paris, 1838, chez Lefèvre, T. II., pp. 481-826.) Cf. *Bossuet*, Lettres sur l'affaire du Quiétisme (Œuvres; nouv. edit., Paris, 1836, 4to, T. XII., pp. 1-514).

to defend his book, and charged the faithful of his flock to leave off reading it. In a pastoral, dated April 9, addressed to the clergy, secular and regular, of his diocese, he published to the whole of France his cheerful acquiescence in the judgment of the Holy See, and begged all his friends to follow his example. This magnanimous conduct spared the Chuch the painful consequences of a new schism.

§ 367. *Literature of the Gallican Church.*

(*Picot*), Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France, etc. *Lacrételle*, Histoire de France au XVIIIe siècle; tr. into German by *Sander*, Berlin, 1810, 2 vols.

The *theological literature* produced by the Gallican Church during this epoch is her special glory and that of her clergy, among whom it took its rise. The *restoration of monastic life* and the revival of a higher moral sense and a purer religious spirit during the preceding age, by men like *Francis de Sales* and *Vincent de Paul*, were now showing their salutary and legitimate fruits. The high standard of education received by the clergy in the establishments belonging to the Congregation of *St. Maur*, to the *Oratory*, and the *Sorbonne* also contributed in its own way and measure to bring about the same result. Apart from the influence of dogmatic controversies, the spirit of scientific investigation was evoked by the interminable discussions on ecclesiastical law and the conflicts with Protestantism. The reign of Louis XIV., prosperous and brilliant from the very outset, inspired the French nation with an enthusiasm and self-assertion that quickened its energies and multiplied its powers. This was the *Golden Age of French Literature*, and while it lasted Theology reigned as Queen. The philosophy of the great *Descartes*, admirable as an aid in speculative theology,[1] was neither as well received nor as generally used as it should have been, and seems from the start to have been suspected of being unsound in matters of *faith*.[2] The work, however, was thoroughly appreciated by Bossuet. The works of the Oratorian, *Malebranche* († 1715),[3] a disciple of Descartes, a thinker of much

[1] *Cartesii*, Opp., Frcf., 1692 sq., 2 T., 4to. *Huetii*, Censura philos. Cartes., Par., 1689, 12mo, ed. IV., 1694. Cf. *Muratori*, De moderat. ingenior. in religion. negotio, lib. II., cap. 13. †*Hock*, Cartesius and his Adversaries, Vienna, 1835, and in the *Freiburg* and *Ashbach's* Eccl. Cyclopædias, article *Cartesius* or Descartes. Cf. †*Günther*, and *Pabst*, The Heads of Ianus, Vienna, 1854, pp. 1-10, 223 sq. *Fr. Bouillier*, Histoire et critique de la revolution cartésienne, Paris, 1842.

[2] Descartes expresses his views on this subject in the following sentiments: "Quæ nobis a Deo sunt revelata credenda sunt. Et quamvis fortasse lumen rationis (quam maxime clarum et evidens) aliud quid nobis suggerere *videretur*, soli tamen auctoritati divinæ potius quam nostro judicio fides est adhibenda." And further on: "Quamvis non clare intelligimus, tamen non recusabimus illa credere, quæ fortasse Deus nobis de se ipso revelet, qualia sunt mysteria Trinitatis et Incarnationis, quæ excedunt naturales ingenii nostri vires." Judged correctly by *Perrone*, Historiæ theologiæ cum philosophia comparatæ, synopsis, nr. 61. (Compend. prælect. theol., Vol. I.) Cf. also *Klee*, Dogmatics, Vol. I., p. 31. The critics sitting in judgment on Descartes have frequently forgotten that, Philosophia quærit, theologia possidet veritatem!

[3] De la recherche de la vérité, 1673; traité de la morale, Rotterd., 1684; traité de la nature et de la grâce, 1682. Cf. *Fénélon*, Réfutation du système de Malebranche sur la nature et la grâce. (Œuv. nouv. éd., T. III., pp. 1-160.)

depth and originality, and a luminous and elegant writer, exercised no little influence on both the theological method and philosophical researches of *Bossuet*, *Huet*, and others. The *Apology* for Christianity, written by Huet, Bishop of *Avranches* († 1721),[1] and based upon purely historical proofs, such as *miracles* and the fulfilment of the *prophecies*, its aim being to disprove the assertion of the Jews that prophecies in no wise support the claims of Christianity, is, in spite of the great learning of its author, far inferior, both in originality and depth of thought and in the justness of its reflections, to the work of *Pascal* († 1672) on the same subject.[2] The line of argument pursued in *Houteville's* († 1742) Apology is also historical.[3]

The Dogmatical History of Religion by *John Claude Sommier* († 1737) deserves special mention, because from a *psychological point of view*[4] it was far in advance of that age. The writers on *dogmatic theology* were both numerous and able, including such names as *John du Hamel*, the Oratorian; the Dominican, *Natalis Alexander; Charles Witasse*, of the Sorbonne; the Jesuit, *Tournely; Billuart*, the Dominican; *Collet*, and others.[5] These were all men of solid learning, and many of them were gifted with penetrating minds and loftiness of conception, and wrote with remarkable grace and lucidity. In spite of their efforts to exclude from their writings the superfluous distinctions of the Schoolmen, these were found to be almost inseparable from the scholastic methods which they employed. The history of dogma, so auspiciously begun by *Petavius*, was continued by *Thomassin* and *Maran*, both of whom were exceedingly clever, and the latter possibly the rival of Petavius himself.[6] *Moral theology* was still regarded as an appendage to dogmatics, and, in the works enumerated, the two were treated together; the former being frequently encumbered with explanations more properly belonging to Canon Law, or, as is notably the case in the writings of the Jesuits, *Busen-*

[1] *Huetii*, Episc. Abrinc., comment. de reb. ad eum pertin., Amst., 1718. Demonstratio evangelica (1679), Amst., 1680. *Origeniana;* cens. phil. Cartes., &c. Cf. *Tholuck*, Miscellaneous Writings, Hamburg, 1839, Vol. I., p. 247 sq. Dr. *Barach*, Huet as a Philosopher, &c., Vienna, 1862.

[2] *Pensées*, Sur la religion, &c., Paris, 1669, published with suppressions and modifications, 2 T., and frequently; in their *primitive* complete shape by M. Prosper Faugère, Paris, 1844, 2 T.; transl. into German by *Blech*, with preface by Neander, Berlin, 1839. Œuvres, La Haye, 1779, 1819, 5 T. *Tholuck*, Miscel. Writ., Vol. I., pp. 224-247. *Weingarten*, Pascal as Apologist of Christianity, Lps., 1863; see above, p. 19, note 7.

[3] *Houteville*, La Religion chrétienne prouvée par les faits; edition augmentée, Paris 1740, 3 vols.; Germ., Frkft., 1745.

[4] Histoire dogmatique de la religion, ou la religion prouvée par l'autorité divine et humaine et par les lumières de la raison, Nancy et Par., 1708 sq., 6 T.

[5] *Du Hamel*, Theol. speculatrix et practica, juxta SS. PP. dogmata pertractata ad usum scholæ accommod., Par., 1691, 7 T., Ven., 1734, 1 T. f. Thence, Theol. Summarium, Par., 1694, 7 T., 12mo. *Natal. Alex.*, Theol. dogm. et moralis, Par., 1693, 10 T., 8vo, 1703, f. *Witasse*, Tractatus de pœnitentia, ordine, eucharistia; de attributis Dei, de Trinit., Incarnatione, etc. (1722), nov. ed., Lovan., 1776, cum notis. *Tournely*, Cursus theologicus scholastico dogmaticus et moralis, pirated ed., Venet., 1728; Col., 1734, and frequently. *Billuart*, Summa S. Thomæ hodiern. academiar., moribus accommodata, Par., 1758; Wirceb., 1758, 3 T., f.; Par., 1841 and 1857, 10 vols., 8vo. *Collet*, Institutiones theol. schol. seu theolog. speculativa, Lugd., 1752, 2 T., f.

[6] *Maran*, Divinitas Dom. N. J. Chr. in scriptor. et tradit., ed. nova, Wirceb., 1859. *Thomassin*, Dogmata theologica, Par., 1684 sq., 3 T., f.

baum[1] and *Voit*,[2] degraded to mere *casuistry*, and almost hopelessly entangled in the painful controversies on *probabilism*. Still *Malebranche's Treatise on Morals;* the *Moral Essays* of the Jansenist, *Peter Nicole;* and the *Demonstration* of *Bernard Lamy*,[3] the Oratorian, were written in a new and more attractive form. But of all those who laboured to spread the truths of Christianity during this epoch, *Salignac de la Motte Fenelon*, Archbishop of Cambrai († 1715),[4] and *Bossuet*, the great Bishop of Meaux († 1704),[5] stand pre-eminent, and each reflects his own special glory upon his age. Fenelon was gifted with a noble intellect, a clear understanding, an active and fertile imagination, and a candid and magnanimous character. His writings, which were addressed alike to intellect and heart, are remarkable for elevation of thought, which of itself would insure their immortality; breathe a refreshing purity of sentiment; fall with rythmic cadence upon the ear; and are in every way models of an elegant, chaste, limpid, and graceful style. The genius of Bossuet was more soaring; his intellect more brilliant; his mind more quick to grasp and solve the difficulties of a question; his learning more extensive; his style more ornate, eloquent, and majestic; and his temperament tinged with a soft religious melancholy, which, lending attractiveness to a great soul like his, lifts it up to the throne of peace and rest.[6]

In spite of the masterpieces of these extraordinary men, *Church History* was richer in products during this epoch than any other field of theological literature. The labours of the *Congregation of St. Maur*, the *Congregation of the Oratory*, and the *Society of Jesus*, in patristic literature, Christian archæology, and church history, are so gigantic in quantity, and withal so perfect in execution, that one is simply amazed at the industry and ability of the various authors. Those of greatest name among the Jesuits were the following: *Fronto le Duc*, *Labbe*, *Cossart*, *John Chifflet*, *Petau*, *Sirmond*, and *John Garnier*. Among the Benedictines: *Montfaucon*, *Mabillon*, *Ménard*, *Le Nourry*, *Coustant*, *Massuet*, *Ruinart*, *Julian Garnier*, *De La Rue*, *Touttée*, *Martianay*, *Prudence Maran*, *D'Achéry*, *Durand*, and *Martène*. Among the Dominicans: *Combefis*, *Goar*, and *Le Quien*. Among the Oratorians: *Morin* and *Thomassin;* to whom are to be added those other great scholars, whose works will live as long as there exists a theological literature, viz., *Cotelier*, *Launoi*, *Buluze*, *Henri de Valois*, and *Renaudot*. *Du Pin* spent his life in preparing a universal biography of

[1] See Vol. 3, p. 476.

[2] *Voit*, S.J., Theologia moralis, Wirceb., 1769; Ancon, 1841, and frequently, 2 vols.

[3] Démonstration de la vérité et de la sainteté de la morale chrétienne, Par., 1688, 12mo; Rouen, 1705, 5 T.; Germ., Lps., 1737.

[4] Œuvres spirit., Amsterd., 1725, 5 T., 12mo; Germ. by *M. Claudius*, Hamburg (2nd ed.), 1823, 3 vols,, and likewise at *Soleure*. Œuvres, nouv. édit., Paris, 1833. *Bausset*, Hist. de Fénélon, Paris, 1809, 3 T., Germ. by *Feder*, Würzburg, 1811, 1812, 3 vols.

[5] Œuv. Ven., 1736 sq., 5 T., 4to; Par., 1744, 4 T.; f. Œuv. posth. Amst. (Par.), 1753, 3 T., 4to. Œuvr. compl. Par., 1836, 12 T., 4to. *Bausset*, Hist. de Boss., Par., 1814, 4 T.; Germ. by *Feder*, Sulzbach, 1820, 4 vols.

[6] See Vol. I., page 34, note 1.

ecclesiastical writers; and his work was supplemented by *Dom Ceillier*, who wrote historical sketches of these authors, and gave lists of their works in chronological order. The Oratorian, *Richard Simon*.[1] may be said to have been the founder of true biblical criticism. Simon was born at Dieppe, May 13, 1638, educated by the Fathers of the Oratory, became afterwards one of their number, and in his studies manifested a decided inclination for philology and archæology. He studied incessantly, laid up great stores of learning, and eventually became one of the greatest biblical critics of his own or any other age. Unhappily, he laid himself open to the assaults of Bossuet and Du Pin by too much freedom and boldness of expression, and by his proneness to overstate and exaggerate. Simon was followed in the same field by *Houbigant*, whose otherwise excellent works on the text of the Old Testament were marred by the pernicious influence of his predecessor. *James Le Long* († 1721) was the author of a bibliography (*Bibliotheca sacra*), containing an account of all the editions and translations of the Scriptures published previously to his time. *Dom Martianay*, of the Congregation of St. Maur († 1717), contributed to advance the science of hermeneutics, as did also *Bernard Lamy*, the Oratorian, by his works, designed to be introductory to a study of the Scriptures.[2] The Jansenist, *De Sacy*, enhanced the value of his translation of the Bible by the addition of learned notes. *Dom Calmet*, the Benedictine, in his commentaries on the whole Bible, does no more than explain the literal sense; still the archæological learning they contain is very valuable.

But among the French ecclesiastics and scholars of this age, there were not alone classical Church historians like *Tillemont*, *Fleury*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Bossuet*, *Harduin*, *Labbe*, and *Cossart*, but also pulpit orators, whose powers of eloquence, wealth of thought, rhetorical skill, and faultless style were literally marvellous. Among these, putting aside *Fenelon* and *Bossuet*, may be named *Fléchier*, Bishop of Nîmes († 1710), who employed his flowery, elevated, and correct style to bring all human greatness under the yoke of the Cross;[3] *Bourdaloue*, of the Society of Jesus († 1704),[4] who, if not so finished or so brilliant as those already mentioned, was more vigorous and solid, and must unquestionably be ranked as one of the greatest of pulpit instructors and orators; *Massillon*, Bishop of Clermont († 1742), unsurpassed in his knowledge of the human heart, and in the skill with which he depicts man in conflict with his passions. His sermons and ecclesiastical conferences were a reflex of his character,

[1] *Richard Simon*, Hist. crit. du texte du V. T.; Hist. crit. du N. T.; Hist. crit. des versions du N. T.; Hist. crit. des principaux commentateurs du N. T. On the other side: *Du Pin*, Dissert. préliminaire sur la bible; *Bossuet*, Défense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères. (Œuv. nouv. éd. Par., 1836, T. II., pp. 120-329). *Graf*, Richard Simon (in Supplements to theological literature, nro. 1, Strasburg, 1847).

[2] Apparatus ad biblia sacra, etc., Gratianopoli, 1687, f.

[3] Panégyriques des saints; Oraisons funèbres; Sermons.

[4] Œuvres complètes, best ed. by *Rigaud*, Paris, 1708-1734, 16 vols.; Versailles, 1812, 16 vols.; nouv. ed., Paris, 1829, 16 vols.; 1838, 5 vols. His life was written by Mme. de Pringy. (Tr.)

exhibiting a happy blending of severity and tenderness, zeal and prudence, which are the natural expression of strong religious feeling, and a deep sense of the responsibility of the pastoral office;[1] and finally, Father *Bridaine* († 1767), a popular orator and an energetic and successful missionary.[2]

§ 368. *Decline of Religious and Theological Science in France—Influence of the Freethinkers of England.*

Abbé *Barruel*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme, T. I., written in England, 1797. (*Stark, J. Aug. von*), Triumph of Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century, Frkft., 1803, 2 pts.; revised by *Buchfelner*, Landshut, 1834. *Binder*, History of the Philosophical and Revolutionary Age, with Respect to Ecclesiastical Affairs, Schaffh., 1844, 2 vols. *Walch*, Modern History of Religion, Vols. I.-III. *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., p. 265. *Gfroerer*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., pp. 388-556. *Cesare Cantù*, Univ. Hist., Vol. XI.

At the close of the age which has been just reviewed, and which shed so much glory upon the Church of France, a decline in religious sentiment set in, and progressed with startling rapidity. The immediate causes of this change are to be sought in the events that took place during the regency of the *Duke of Orleans*, and in the frightful immorality prevalent at court, where religion, no longer held in honour, and ceasing to be more than a routine ceremony and an external form, became an object of derisive mockery to those who still condescended to pay a semblance of respect to what they no longer regarded as other than a barren worship. And the spirit of irreligion that came into fashion at court went down from rank to rank, until in the end it reached the lowest stratum of society. The deplorable issue of the Jansenistic controversy also contributed in its way to the extinction of the religious sentiment, and to make piety ridiculous. The very foundations of the teaching on morals were loosened by the heated controversy on *Probabilism*, which the Jesuits defended with zealous warmth and the witty Jansenists assailed with caustic severity. Scepticism in historical studies, whence it spread to every other branch of science and literature, leaving everywhere the baneful effects of its presence, found favour with some of the members of the great Society of Jesus, a few of whom, like *Harduin*[3]

[1] *Massillon*, Œuvres complètes, 12 vols., published by his nephew, in 1745, 1746; later editions are those of Beaucé (4 vols., 1817); Méquignon, 15 vols., 1818, 3 vols., Paris, 1838; and Chalandre (3 vols., 1847). The "*Ecclesiastical Conferences*," which, along with the *Petit carême*, established his reputation; tr. into English by *Boylan*, of Maynooth; publ. at Dublin, 1825, in 2 vols.; then dedicated to the Right Rev. John MacHale, "out of gratitude for long and distinguished services!" (Tr.)

[2] Sermons du Père *Bridaine*, Avignon, 1827, 7 vols. Cf. *Maury*, Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire, Paris, 1810.

[3] It would seem that Harduin put forward his opinions rather from love of paradox and desire of notoriety than from any serious belief in their truth. Putting aside the writings of *Cicero*, *Pliny's* Natural History, *Virgil's* Georgics, the comedies of *Plautus*, and the Satires of *Horace*, in Latin, and in Greek *Homer's* Iliad and the History of *Herodotus*, he maintained that all the rest of the works included in the body of ancient classical literature were falsely attributed to authors whose names they bore, being really the productions of monks of the thirteenth century. He was equally incredulous with

(† 1729) and his disciple, *Berruyer* († 1748), carried it to a dangerous excess. The latter professed to regard the Old Testament as no more than a mere romance,[1] and greatly scandalized the faithful by the profane flippancy of his writings. His works, though condemned by ecclesiastical authority and censured by the members of his own Society, had an unprecedented sale, and were read with avidity.[2] Religious sentiment gradually died out, and anything approaching an appreciative knowledge of Christianity became extinct. Honest historical research and laborious investigation were discontinued, and in their place sprung up a wordy and pretentious science, which was dignified by the name of philosophy, and faithfully reflected the spirit and tendency of the age.

England,[3] now Protestant to its very core, was held up to the world as the land of freedom of thought, and the teaching of her philosophers was hailed with general applause. The *empiricism* of *Locke* († 1704), which necessarily issued in rank *materialism*, was received with particular favour in France. Too profligate and too effete to give birth to any original ideas themselves, the leaders of thought and the representatives of learning tamely submitted to accept a philosophy that made the five senses of man the supreme intellectual criterion, and gave matter dominion over mind. Lord *Edward Herbert of Cherbury* († 1648) had already maintained that the divine character of Christianity might be shown to be probable, but could not be demonstrated with absolute certainty; and that to believe in God, to live virtuously, to be penitent for sins and mend one's life, and to be persuaded that good deeds will be rewarded and evil punished in the life to come, are conditions quite sufficient for salvation.

Toland, an Irishman by birth († 1722), questioned the authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures, reviled the clergy, and attempted to prove that *Christianity is not mysterious*, and that the Gospel contains

regard to ancient coins and the specimens of art which have been unanimously ascribed to the classic age. Even the authors of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament did not escape the censure of his sceptical incredulity, and he also endeavoured to show that those portions of the New Testament, which are known to have been originally written in Greek, were really written in Latin. He was required by the authorities of the Society to retract these expressions of opinion; but it is said that, having been expostulated with by a friend and a member of the Society, who represented to him that people were greatly shocked at his paradoxical absurdities, he replied: "Now, do you really think I should have risen every morning of my life to say over again what others have said before me?" Abbé *Rohrbacher*, Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Cath., Vol. 26, Bk. 88, p. 107 sq.; also *Feller's* Biogr.-Dict. (Tr.)

[1] Histoire du peuple de Dieu, etc., Paris et la Haye, 1728, 7 vols, 4to, or 10 vols., 12mo; 1758, 14 vols. Cf. *Freiburg*. Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 852; Fr. tr., Vol. 3, p. 29 sq.

[2] "Les condamnations dont la (cette histoire) frappèrent les évêques de Montpellier et Soissons, l'assemblée du clergé à Conflans, la Sorbonne et les papes Benoit XIV. et Clement XIII., lui firent un succès immerité." So *Dictionnaire Général de Biographie et d'Histoire*, Paris, 1869, 2 vols. (Tr.)

[3] *Thorschmid*, Essay of a Complete Library of Freethinkers, Halle, 1765 sq., 4 vols. Cf. *Leo*, Manual of Univ. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 173 sq.

nothing above reason.[1] Lord *Shaftesbury*, a disciple of Locke's († 1713), seized every available occasion to cast ridicule upon the Bible, the prophecies, and miracles, making his assaults all the more dangerous by veiling a delicate irony under a simulated reverence for religion. The same tactics were followed by *Anthony Collins* († 1729), with whom the name *Freethinker* originated. *Thomas Woolston* († 1733), in a work published in 1705, and supplemented by others in succeeding years, put an allegorical interpretation upon the whole of the Bible, maintaining that the personages of the Old Testament were typical and not real; that the miracles of both the Old and the New were only admirably contrived allegories;[2] and that the Gospel narratives were a tissue of absurdities.[3]

Tindal, a Doctor of Laws († 1733), who was an avowed enemy of priests and of the ministers of every form of religion,[4] made a powerful attack upon the miraculous character of the Gospel, denying the necessity of revelation, and maintaining that human reason was all-sufficient.[5]

William Lyon († 1713) proclaimed the infallibility of human reason, and asserted that, inasmuch as a divine revelation is inconceivable, and miracles cannot be demonstrated, the ecclesiastical state is of purely human invention and a perpetual imposture. *David Hume* the celebrated historian († 1776), was arrogantly sceptical, denying outright the truth of Christianity, and asserting that polytheism was the oldest form of religion, from which, as time went on, came monotheism, and from this again *pure Deism*, which of all beliefs mostly commends itself to the reason.[6]

"Indifference in matters of religion," said *Bossuet*, "is the bane of our age. It is openly avowed in England and Holland, and is not unfrequently to be met with even among Catholics. I am convinced that the influence of the Freethinkers will decline, not indeed because their opinions are abhorred, but because of the spirit of indifference to everything but gain and pleasure." The apathy which the great Bishop of Meaux so pathetically deplored, opened the way to the introduction into France of the spirit of irreligion, which was rapidly succeeded by a rancorous hostility to every form

[1] His most important work is that entitled, "Christianity not Mysterious; A Treatise showing that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason or above it," London, 1696. (Tr.)

[2] The Old Apology of the Truth of the Christian Religion against the Jews and Gentiles revived, London, 1705. (Tr.)

[3] Discourses (six) on the Miracles of Christ, London, 1727 sq. (Tr.)

[4] Rights of the Christian Church asserted against the Romish and all other Priests, &c., London, 1706. (Tr.)

[5] Christianity as old as the Creation, or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature, London, 1730. (Tr.)

[6] His most important religious work, Dialogues concerning Natural Religion, was completed in 1751, but, owing to the advice of friends, not published until 1778, about two years after his death. (Tr.) *Lechler*, History of Deism in England, Stuttg., 1841. *Riffel*, Deism in England and its Echo in Germany (The "*Catholic*," 1848, nros. 36-38, 40, 41). *Freiburg* Cyclop., art. "*Deism*" and "*Deists*."

of Christianity. This hatred was intensified by the action of the clergy, who, taking advantage of the restrictions of the press, which was not so free in France as on the other side of the channel, endeavoured to wrench the weapons from the hands of their adversaries. These were not so easily silenced. They began to publish accounts of travel in distant lands, in which, under disguises more or less thin, they assailed Christianity and the Church, ridiculing both as institutions peculiar to the far-away peoples whom they had visited. Such was the character of *Vairesse's* History of the *Sévérambes;*[1] the Voyage and Adventures of *James Massé*, by *Simon Tyssot de Patot;* a Description of the Island of Borneo, by *Fontenelle;* the Persian Letters, by *Montesquieu;* and the Life of Mohammed, by Count *Henri de Bouillon-Villers* († 1722), in which the author endeavours to show that Mohammedanism is superior to Christianity. The sceptic *Bayle* was the persistent and malignant foe of the Bible, maintaining in his *Critical and Historical Dictionary*, through which his attacks were made, that society could not only go on perfectly well without religion, but would be greatly improved by its absence.

These isolated assaults were subsequently made more effective by a permanent organization of a number of conspirators against the Christian name, who had sworn to bring about the total overthrow of the Church. Their cry was, "*Crush the infamous thing!*" (*Ecrasez l'infame!*) meaning the Christian religion and Christ its Head. At the head of the conspirators was *Francis Mary Arouet*, or, as he called himself, *Voltaire*, a young man and a poet of extraordinary ability, who, as *Condorcet*, his panegyrist, relates, had taken a solemn oath "to devote his whole life to the work of destroying Christianity, and with it all positive religion." Hence the one uniform theme of his discourses and writings, presented under an endless variety of forms during his long and chequered career, was summed up in the assertion that the Christian religion is the invention of priests.[2] He died in 1778. His principal accomplices were *D'Alembert*, whose tactics consisted in attempting to stifle religion by skilfully contrived stratagems; *Diderot*, who openly professed himself an atheist; and *Damilaville*, of whom Voltaire said that he did not deny, but *hated God.* Their most important work against Christianity, and indeed against all positive religion, was the *Encyclopædia*, published under the editorial management of D'Alembert and Diderot. Perhaps no work ever published did as much to propagate error and irreligion. The dishonesty of the editors is apparent from the fact that they uniformly substituted the term "*nature*" in texts in which the words God and Providence occur. *Condillac* († 1780), *Helvetius*, and the infamous *Julian Offroy de la Mettrie* professed themselves pure materialists. In their works nature holds the place of God; spirit is

[1] Hist. des Sévérambes, Paris, 1677 sq., 3 T., 12mo; Sulzbach, 1689, 3 vols.

[2] *Stark-Buchfelner*, L. cit., p. 34 sq. *Robiano*, T. I., p. 300 sq. *Harel*, Voltaire, particularités curieuses de sa vie et de sa mort., etc., Paris, 1817. Cf. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the French Revolution, Vol. I., p. 7-10.

only a form of matter; and all religion is a political institution, invented by priests, and capable of deceiving none but idiots.[1] Even the great *Buffon* frequently fails, in his Natural History, to distinguish between God and nature, between mind and matter. The astronomer, *Lalande*, studied the heavens without having his mind lifted up to their Maker, and in all his works the name of God does not occur once. All of these, including *Volney* († 1820) and *Dupuis* († 1809), denied the reality of biblical personages,[2] and pronounced the Gospel narrative the reverie of an astronomer.

If *Rousseau* († 1778) at times spoke respectfully and even eloquently of Christianity, he was no less audacious than his colleagues in his attacks on the miracles of the Gospel, and on the whole history of the Bible, which, he said, so bristled with contradictions that no reasonable man could give credence to it. Such is the spirit that runs through the famous *Profession de foi du Vicaire Savoyard*, and through his still more famous pedagogical utopia, *Emile*.[3] His hostility to Christianity is still more pronounced in the "*Contrat Social*," where he charges the Christian religion with having severed the unity of States, extinguished the spirit of patriotism, pandered to the designs of tyrants, and annihilated the manly virtues. Finally, a society of a political character was formed, whose members, calling themselves *Economists* or "*Physiocrats*," demanded unrestricted freedom of trade and industry; absolute equality in the distribution of public offices; and a complete and thorough revolution in all established and traditionary methods and systems; held out illusory and utopian promises of unbounded wealth and material prosperity; declared war against Christianity; pronounced belief in God an evidence of mental infirmity; and rejected the views of Voltaire and Rousseau as entirely too moderate, and deserving only a contemptuous dismissal from men of more "advanced" thoughts.

To the reflecting and far-seeing the evils that then afflicted the Church of France were a certain presage of an approaching catastrophe. *Labat* († 1803), a member of the Congregation of St. Maur, and *Neuville*, the celebrated preacher, spoke out in sorrowful and eloquent accents, warning their countrymen of the dangers that threatened at once the altar of God and the throne of the king. The French clergy, in two assemblies, held respectively in 1765 and 1770, drew the attention of the king to the dangerous character of the writings of the Freethinkers, and proposed a plan of arresting the progress of the wicked conspiracy.[4] A memorial, that appeared

[1] Ceci est exageré quant à Condillac, quoique 'il n'y ait pas loin du sensualisme ou matérialisme. (Note of the French translators.—Tr.)

[2] *Volney*, Ruins; Reflections upon the Revolutions of Empires, published in 1794; the year previous he published the Natural Laws. In the former work he maintains, with a great deal of sarcasm and mockery, the human origin and essential falsity of *all* religious systems; in the latter he treats morality as a physical and material science. (Tr.) *Dupuis*, Origine de tous les cultes, Paris, 1794, 12 vols.

[3] *Stark-Buchfelner*, L. c., p. 80 sq.

[4] Avertissement du clergé de France sur les dangers de l'incrédulité.

shortly after, set men to thinking still more seriously of the dangers that were ahead, and of the necessity of adopting some means to avert them. Men of ability and learning published works in defence of Christianity and the commonwealth, both of which were menaced with destruction, if something were not done, and that speedily, to prevent a great social, political, and religious convulsion. The parliament was convoked by order of the attorney-general, *Séguier*,[1] and, on the representations of the clergy, condemned seven notoriously scandalous works, and ordered them to be burned. But beyond this that body did nothing in the cause of truth and religion. The enemies of the Christian name were conscious that they were daily gaining in number and growing in influence. Foreign princes, ministers of state, and other officials joined their ranks, and, strengthened by the accession and aided by the influence of powerful statesmen like *Choiseul* and *Malesherbes*, they succeeded in largely controlling establishments for the education of youth. *Malesherbes* being, in virtue of his office of Director of the Library, Censor of the Press, placed no obstacle in the way of the publication and circulation of the irreligious works of the day. The torrent of evil had been hourly gaining strength, and was now irresistible. Strange to say, at the very time that a spirit of frivolity and thoughtlessness was dominant in Church and Society, and working the ruin of both, a Religious Order was founded, whose Rule was more severe than that of any body that had ever existed in the Church. *Le Bouthillier de Rancé*,[2] a wealthy and learned prelate, who, after having spent the flower of his youth in the excesses of gay and fashionable dissipation, became a prey to the poignant upbraidings of conscience, entered the convent of Cîteaux de *la Trappe* (1662), in the diocese of Sens, of which he was from his youth destined to be the abbot. He restored the primitive severity of the Rule, and so great was the austerity practised by the Trappists, as the disciples of Rancé were now called, that they were forbidden even to *speak* to each other or to cultivate any of the branches of *science*. Against the latter prohibition the learned Benedictine, *John Mabillon*, wrote his *Traité des études monastiques* (*De studiis monasticis*). Bossuet, to clear the controversy that followed of its obscurity and confusion, pointed out the fact that Rancé, in discussing the subject, had failed to make a necessary

[1] "Réquisitoire, sur lequel est intervenu l'arrêt du Parlement, année 1770," printed by injunction of the king. Cf. *Walch*, Modern Religious History, Pt. I., pp. 471-486; Pt. II., p. 3 sq. *Robiano*, L. cit., T. II., p. 53.

[2] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 569. *Rancé*, Traité de la sainteté et des devoirs de la vie montastique, 1683, 2 T., 4to. Against it: *Mabillon*, Traité des études monast., 1691, and frequently; in Latin, De studiis monasticis. *Marsollier*, Vie de l'abbé de la Trappe, Par., 1703, 2 T, 12mo. L. D. B., Hist. civile, rel. et littér. de l'abbaye de la Tr., Par., 1824. *Exauvillez*, Vie de l'abbé de Rancé, Par., 1842. *Chateaubriand*, Vie de Rancé, Par., 1844; Germ., Ulm., 1844. *Gaillardin*, Les Trappistes ou l'ordre de Cîteaux au XIX. siècle; histoire de la Trappe depuis sa fondation jusqu'à nos jours, Par., 1844, T. I. (to 1790). Cf. *Supplementum* ad Natal. Alex. h. e., Bingæ, 1791, p. 689-704. *Dubois*, Histoire de l'abbé de Rancé, etc., Paris, 1866.

distinction between the conditions proper to the life of a hermit and those proper to that of a monk living in a community.

Notwithstanding the extreme austerity of the Order, numbers came to seek admission into it, and when the horrors of the Revolution and the glories of the empire had become things of the past, it still flourished and put forth fresh tokens of life and energy. Rancé died in 1700.

§ 369. *The Catholic Church in Italy and Spain.*

While the Church of France was in conflict, that of Italy enjoyed comparative peace and quiet, at least until towards the close of the French Revolution, when the events of that stirring period began to produce their effects to the south of the Alps. The Pope, as has been already stated, had been engaged in warm controversies with many of the European sovereigns, and had met them all single-handed. His heart was cheered, however, by the evidence of religious activity and a healthy religious tone visible in his own and the neighbouring States. The bishops were untiring in their efforts to revive the faith of the people, and *missions* were becoming daily more frequent. To the older orders devoted to this apostolic work another was now added, namely, the *Redemptorist*, founded by *St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori.*[1] Alphonsus was born at Naples, of a noble family, in 1696, and, after having made a successful course of law studies, and practised at the bar with distinction, threw up the profession in disgust, and, placing himself unreservedly in the hands of God, saying, "O Lord, here I am, do with me as Thou willest," began the study of theology, was ordained a priest in 1722, and two years later entered the Society of Missionaries of the *Propaganda* at Naples. As a priest he devoted himself mainly to preaching and the direction of souls, and in the course of a mission, given in the neighbourhood of Amalfi, in which he took an active part, was pained to learn that the country people there and elsewhere had their spiritual wants but indifferently cared for. Grieved at the sight of so much spiritual poverty among people so destitute of this world's goods, he took comfort in the thought that he would one day found a congregation whose members would supply them religious instruction, and give themselves up wholly to their service. Authorized by Pope Clement XII., he founded, in the year 1732, the Congregation of the *Most Holy Redeemer*, composed of secular priests, who are willing to spend their lives in instructing the people and training the young. Their Rule was published June 21, 1742, and their founder intrusted with the supreme direction of the Order, under the name of Superior-General.[2]

Obstacles that had not been anticipated stood in the way of the

[1] *A. Giatini*, Vita del beato Alfonso Liguori, Roma, 1815, 4to; Germ., Vienna, 1835. *Jeancard*, Vie du bienheureux Alphonse Liguori, Marseille et Louvain, 1829.

[2] Their Constitution and Rule is found in German, in the January nro. of the Journal "*Sion*" of 1842 (nros. 7 sq.). Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 217 sq.

accomplishment of the wise and benevolent designs of the founder, and it required all his strength of character and patient perseverance to remove them. The world persisted in misunderstanding or misinterpreting the aims of the *Redemptorists*, claiming that they were only Jesuits under another name, and, as such, worthy of all the calumny and persecution with which that body was so unjustly pursued; but their incessant and disinterested labours eventually established beyond all question the purity of the motives by which their founder was inspired, and the world practically, if not formally confessed its mistake.

Originally the missions of the Redemptorists opened with a sermon, announcing to the inhabitants of the town, village, or district that their purpose in coming among them was *to revive a religious spirit and to correct morals*, and calling upon them to be regular in their attendance at the instructions, to receive the Sacraments, and to observe, as far as circumstances would permit, the rules laid down for the conduct of the spiritual exercises. A short instruction was given in the morning, and in the evening a more elaborate discourse was preached. In the selection of subjects, the order laid down in the Exercises of St. Ignatius was mainly followed, the leading ones being the end and fall of man, the misery entailed by sin, and the justice and judgment of God. In the course of the exercises discourses were given on the mercy of God through Jesus Christ, on the merits of the Saviour, on the nature and use of prayer, on the fruits of penance, on the frequentation of the Sacraments, and on other kindred subjects. The closing discourse was usually a stirring and powerful appeal, exhorting the people to persevere in the way on which they had so happily entered during the mission. While these missions were in progress, public officials and persons of the highest rank and station came forward to offer their services in instructing the people and the children, under the direction of the Redemptorists. In the year 1762, while engaged in these apostolic labours, Alphonsus de Liguori was appointed Bishop of *Sant' Agata dei Goti*, in the kingdom of Naples, where he displayed all the virtues of a pontiff wholly devoted to the welfare of his flock. Though a laborious and model bishop, he never ceased to take the liveliest interest in his congregation, to which he returned in the year 1775, after resigning his see, from the responsibilities of which he shrank. He was now far advanced in age and broken in health, and, after spending a few more years among his spiritual children, whom he loved so well, he died, surrounded by them, at Nocera, on the 1st of August, 1787. His life had been wholly spent in the service of God, and his memory, his deeds, and above all his example, have been held in grateful remembrance by the faithful, but particularly by those of his own household. His *numerous writings* have been a guide and comfort to many souls[1] in these latter

[1] He left a number of theological and devotional works, including, besides others, Theol. Mor., Naples, 1775; author's 9th and best ed., 1785; Directorium Ordinandor.,

days, and have given him rank among the great teachers of the Church. He was solemnly canonized by Gregory XVI. on the feast of Pentecost, 1839, and declared a Doctor of the Church by Pius IX., March 23, 1871.

During this season of apparent lethargy Italy produced both saints and scholars, and of the latter some were known throughout the whole of Europe. *Denina*, a professor of Turin, published a practical introduction to the study of theology of considerable merit. Of the *Popes*, several wrote elegant verses, but as an author *Benedict XIV.*[1] was the most distinguished among them. *Muratori*,[2] a friend of Benedict XIV., employed his splendid talents and his extensive erudition in writing works on history and other subjects, which will be held in esteem for all time, wherever scholarship is valued or literary finish appreciated. He was also instrumental in bringing theologians, who were still under the influence of the sharp and rude polemics of a former age, to be more temperate in tone, more dignified in manner, and more scholarly in method. Cardinal *Bona* († 1674) published valuable works on liturgy and asceticism ;[3] Cardinal *Noris* some excellent dissertations on the Pelagian controversies and other

Venice, 1758 ; Opera Dogmatica, 1770 ; Istoria di tutte l'eresie con loro confutazione, 3 vols., 8vo, 1773; Istruzione pratica per i confessori della gente di campagna, 3 vols., Bassano, 1780; Homo Apostolicus Instructus in sua Vocatione, 3 vols., 4to, Venice, 1782, and Le glorie di Maria, 2 vols., 8vo, 1784. Various other editions of his works : Collezione completa delle opere di St. Alphon. Maria de Liguori, Monza, 1839 sq., 68 vols., 12mo. Opere complete (exclusa *theologia morali*), Venez., 1833 sq., 60 vols. ; tr. fr. the Ital. into Germ., by *Hugues*, Ratisb., 1842-47, in three sections, *ascetical*, *dogmatical*, and *moral* works. His Theologia moralis, in many editions; the best, cura *P. Mich. Heilig*, Mechlin. et Mogunt., 1845 sq., 10 T. : *M. Haringer*, Ratisb., 1846 ; also that of Ancona, 1842, in 6 vols., is a good edition ; Homo apostolicus s. praxis et instructio confessariorum, Mogunt., 1842; Germ., Ratisbon, 1841; Aix-la-Chapelle, 1842. His complete works were translated into French in 30 vols., 8vo, 1834 sq. Of the Œuvres Complètes de S. Alphonse de Liguori traduites de l'italien et mises en ordre par les pères *Leop. Dujardin* et *Jules Jacques*, C. SS. R., the following seven vols. have appeared : Œuvres Dogmatiques ; Verité de la foi, 2 vols., Paris, 1866; Triomphe de l'église, Paris, 1867-1870 ; Défense des Dogmes Catholiques, 2 vols., Paris, 1871, 1872. His "*Selva*," 2 T., Paris and Lyons, 1854 ; Preparation for Death, Boston, 1851 ; Sermons, the Glories of Mary, Visits to the Most Bl. Sacr., and many other of his devotional works have been translated into English, and frequently republished. Cfr. *Villecourt*, Vie de S. Alphonse, T. 4. (Tr.)

[1] Cf., above, § 363, p. 11, note 1. The most valuable and best known works of this Pope are : De Servorum Dei beatificatione et Beatorum canonizatione ; De sacrificio missæ ; De festis Christi et Mariæ ; Institutiones ecclesiasticæ ; De Synodo Diœcesana, in many edit., Mechl., 1823. The best edit. of the complete works of Benedict XIV. is that by the Spanish Jesuit, *Azevedo*, Rome, 1747-51, in 13 vols., 4to : another far-spread ed. is that of Prato, 1842 sq., in 18 vols., 4to. There is an ed. of his De beatif. et canoniz. SS., in 7 vols., fol., Bassano, 1778 (The Rom. ed. has but 5 vols.), and his Bullarium, in 4 vols., fol., Venice, 1768. There is an Engl. transl., in 3 vols., On Heroic Virtue, being part of De Beatif., &c. (Tr.)

[2] Scriptores rer. Ital. ; Antiquitates Ital. med. ævi.; Liturgia Romana vetus, Ven., 1728, 2 T., fol. De moderatione ingeniorum in religionis negotio, whereof there are numerous editions, Aug., Vind., 1779 ; partially transl. into Germ., by *Biunde* and *Braun*, Coblenz, 1837.

[3] *Bona*, De rebus liturgicis, and several other valuable works : De sacrificio missæ tractatus asceticus, ed. *Sintzel*, Ratisb., 1841 ; Manuductio ad cœlum ; De principiis vitæ chr. (opp. Tur., 1747 sq., 4 T. fol.)

subjects ;[1] and Cardinal *Tommasi*, besides his liturgical and exegetical writings, some profound works on the Fathers.[2] *Mamachi*, *Selvaggio*, and *Pelliccia* devoted themselves to the study of ecclesiastical antiquities; and *Orsi*, *Saccarelli*, *Berti*, and others to that of Church history. *Dominic Mansi* edited the fullest collection of the Councils ever published ;[3] the Jesuit, *Tiraboschi* († 1794), wrote a most exhaustive and accurate *History of Italian Literature*,[4] embracing both ancient and modern Italy. *Genér*, a Spaniard, and a member of the same society, wrote a dogmatical work in six volumes, quarto, which, although never completed, is very valuable, from the fact that he works into his subject all the information he could derive from the Christian inscriptions and pictorial representations which in his day had been brought to light in the Catacombs; *John Bernard de' Rossi*, a professor at Parma, was a diligent and laborious critic of the Old Testament, and published an excellent collection of the various readings of the text ;[5] and *Martini*, Archbishop of Florence, made an Italian translation of the Bible, adding short explanatory notes (fr. 1784), which, having been approved and warmly recommended by Pope *Pius VI.*, went through many editions, and is still in use at the present day. The best edition of the works of St. Jerome was prepared by *Dominic Vallarsi*, of Verona; and the best edition of those of St. Hilary by *Scipio Maffei*. *Andrew Gallandi*, a Father of the Oratory, edited the best collection of the works of the earliest Fathers and ecclesiastical writers; and the Brothers *Assemani* published a collection of the literary treasures of the Eastern Church. The *Ballerini* brothers published a series of clever dissertations on the works of *Leo the Great*, designed as a refutation of those written by *Quesnel*,[6] and made some valuable contributions to the science of Canon Law. Fresh activity and wider scope were given to the intellectual movement by the action of *Leopold*, Grand Duke *of Tuscany*, who attempted to introduce into his States the reforms of his brother, Joseph II. He was seconded in this design by *Scipio Ricci*,[7] Bishop of Pistoja and Prato, who, in 1786, at a *diocesan synod*, convened in the former city, presented for the acceptance of his clergy an instrument containing fifty-seven articles, setting forth the principles of the Gallican Church

[1] Works, Verona, 1729-1732, 5 vols., fol.

[2] Institutiones theologiæ antiquorum Patrum, Romanæ, 1709-1712, 8 T.

[3] Brought down to A. D. 1439, 31 vols.

[4] His *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* (13 vols., Modena, 1772-83; best. ed., 16 vols., Milan. 1822-26) extends from the earliest times to the end of the seventeenth century. A continuation, embracing the literature of the eighteenth century, was written by *Lombardi*. (Tr.)

[5] He collected and collated in all six hundred and eighty Hebrew MSS., in addition to the five hundred and eighty which Kennicott had collected. *Dixon's* Intr. to the S. Scriptures, p. 71. (Tr.)

[6] Ed. corrected on the authority of Vatican MSC., Venice, 1755-57, 3 vols. See Vol. I., p. 35 sq.

[7] Cf. *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., p. 555 sq. *Robiana*, T. II., p. 72 sq.

and the extreme teachings of Jansenism.[1] Doubtful of the temper of his clergy he had provided against defeat by calling to the Synod a number of ecclesiastics from the neighbouring States, of whose sentiments he was assured, and among whom was the ultra-Gallican professor of Pavia, *Peter Tamburini.* The great bulk of the decisions arrived at by the Synod were erroneous, being in direct opposition to the teaching and the practice of the Church. They related chiefly to the government of the Church; to the authority of Councils; to the manner of holding divine worship, which, it was said, should be conducted in the language of the people; to the number of altars; to the veneration of images, &c. The system of Quesnel was approved; the Grand Duke was accorded privileges wholly irreconcilable with the rights of the Church; and it was maintained that in the future only *one* Religious Order should be permitted in the Church, and that all the houses of that one should adopt the Rule of the Jansenistic convent of Port-Royal.

Encouraged by this success, Leopold summoned the seventeen bishops of Tuscany to meet him at Florence (1787), with a view to introducing the acts of the Synod of Pistoja into all the dioceses of his dominions. He soon learned that he had mistaken the temper of the bishops, by the larger number of whom he was so vigorously opposed, and having dissolved the synod, was shortly afterwards informed that the populace, infuriated at the treachery of Ricci, had demolished his palace (1787).

Joseph II. died in 1790, and Leopold immediately left Tuscany to ascend the imperial throne. The excitement spread into every diocese of Tuscany, and so fierce was the popular indignation that Ricci was eventually forced to resign. The acts of the Synod of Pistoja, which the creatures of the Government were actively engaged in circulating, were condemned by Pope *Pius VI.* in the bull *Auctorem fidei* (1794),[2] which Ricci, after considerable delay and hesitancy, finally subscribed (1799). He gave a fresh proof of the sincerity of his retractation at Florence in 1805, on the occasion of the return of *Pius VII.* from France.

In *Spain* the intellectual movement, which in some respects had the same characteristics as that of France, was mainly confined to the branches of *dogmatic theology* and *canon law.* As in the preceding epoch, the Spanish Church had produced theologians of the greatest name, like Melchior Cano, Vega, Salmeron, Toletus, Maldonatus, Montanus, Bañez, De Lugo, Molina, Vasquez, Suarez, and others, so also in the present one she was not without creditable representatives in the queen of sciences. Of these may be mentioned *Thyrsus Gonzales,* who subsequently became General of the Society of Jesus

[1] The acts published by *Schwarzel,* Acta congregat. archiepiscop. et episcopor., etc., Hetruriæ, etc., Bamberg. et Herbip., 1790 sq., 7 T. See **Freiburg* Ecci. Cyclop., Vol. VIII., p. 467-480; Fr. tr., Vol. 18, p. 337 sq.

[2] It is found in the Leipsic stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, pp. 292-327.

(† 1705), and who was the author of a work entitled *Manuductio ad conversionem Muhametanorum*, and a refutation of the theory of probabilism (See Thesaur. libr. Cathol., Vol. I.), *Emmanuel Bernard de Ribera* († 1765), the author of a work on philosophy (*Institutiones philosophicæ*); and finally *Florez*, an Augustinian Friar, who commenced the great national work *La España sagrada*, published at Madrid between the years 1747 and 1779, in twenty-nine volumes, quarto.

§ 370. *The Catholic Church in Germany.*

Cam. Paganel, Hist. of Joseph II., Emperor of Germany, Lps., 1844, 2 vols. *Lorenz*, Joseph II. and the Belgian Revolution, Vienna, 1862. "Joseph II. and His Age; the Liberty of the Press under Joseph II." (*Historical* and *Political Papers*, Vols. III. and VIII.) *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII. *Sebastian Brunner*, Theological Flunkeyism at the Court of Joseph II.; Secret Correspondence and Disclosures from Unpublished Documents, found in the R. and I. Archives, Vienna, 1868. *Ritter*, Emp. Joseph II. and His Reforms; Appendix, "Pius VI.'s Journey to Vienna," Ratisbon, 1868. *Wolf*, The Abolition of the Monasteries in Austria, Vienna, 1871. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. V., p. 794 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12.

The repose secured to Germany by the Peace of Westphalia gradually degenerated into a dangerous lethargy, which lasted for above a century; and when at length *Maria Teresa* ascended the throne, and Austria began to give tokens of returning life, the efforts made to revive the torpid energies of Catholics were connected with so many destructive and subversive principles that it seemed problematic which was preferable, the present revival or the former state of inactivity.[1] Putting aside the labours of some distinguished men in attempting to establish unity and harmony among the churches, there was no movement deserving attention during this epoch. *Charles Werner*[2] thus describes the feelings of Catholics and Protestants at this time: "Calixtus," said he, "complained, in closing his irenical address, that there was no chance for peace in Germany as long as Catholic theologians, on the one hand, persisted in refusing to give up papistic theology, and in stigmatizing Protestants as heretics and men forsaken of God; nor, on the other, as long as one-half of the German people were incited against the Catholics by the ceaseless declamation of fanatical preachers, and the Protestant portion would not be persuaded that the evils that afflicted Germany arose out of the unfortunate schism into which the Fatherland had been precipitated by the so-called Reformers. And," he added, "there is no other way of restoring peace and concord to the Germans except by a return of the Protestants to the unity of Catholic truth." Notwithstanding that the efforts of the princes had failed, in 1644, to restore unity, it was hoped those of *John Philip de Schoenborn*, the prudent elector of Mentz in 1660, would be more successful. His minister of state, the Baron of *Boyneburg*, a convert, together with the brothers *Walen-*

[1] *Schwicker*, The Last Years of the reign of the Empress Queen Maria Teresa (1763-1780), Prague, 1871, 2 vols.

[2] *Werner*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature, Vol. IV., p. 750.

burch, *Herman Conring*, and others, encouraged by an invitation, addressed to Catholics and Protestants, by *Matthew Prætorius*, a Protestant, who subsequently entered the Church, calling on them to meet in Conference, put forth his best efforts to adjust difficulties and bring about a union.[1]

It was soon apparent that the proposed conditions of union were both indefinite and impracticable. The Catholic Church could never acquiesce in half-measures and partial concessions. There were only two alternatives possible—either to reject *in toto* or accept *in toto the principle of her infallible magisterial authority*. *Christopher Rojas de Spinola*, who was at first appointed Bishop of Tina, in Croatia (from 1688), and afterwards transferred to Neustadt, near Vienna († 1695), having been invested by Leopold I. with full power to do what he could towards bringing about a reunion of the churches, again renewed the attempts that had so often failed. Overtures were made to and accepted by the Court of Hanover, in behalf of which *Molanus* (Van der Muelen), Abbot of Lokkum,[2] was commissioned to draw up a plan of union, and *Leibnitz*, who was already in correspondence with *Pélisson* and *Bossuet*[3] on the subject, requested to use his influence for the attainment of the same end. If the efforts of these great men were unsuccessful, they at least made clear to both parties the only possible basis of a union; brought both to understand each other better, and to entertain more kindly feelings; and in this way relieved the Church of many of the charges *falsely* brought against her. A like effect was produced by the compendious but masterly *Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine* by Bossuet, in which, while clearly setting forth the Catholic teaching, he did full justice to the objections and prejudices of the Protestants, proving to them by irrefragable argu-

[1] *Matth. Prætorii* tuba pacis ad universas dissidentes in occidente ecclesias seu de unione ecclesiarum romanæ et protestantium; Germ. by *Einterim*, 1826. *Walenburch*, Fratres *A.* et *P.* de, Tractatus generalis et specialis de controversiis fidei, Col., 1670, 2 T., f.

[2] Super reunione Protestantium cum eccles. cathol. tractatus inter Jacob. Benign. Bossuetum, episc. Meldens., et Molanum, Abbatem in Lockum. Vienn. Austr., 1783, 4to. (**Prechtl*), Bossuet, Leibnitz, and Molanus in treaty for the reunion of the Catholics and Protestants, Sulzb., 1815. Cf. *Guhrauer*, Biography of Leibnitz. To these attempts also belong Leibnitz's *Systema theologicum*, published in Latin and German, by *Raess* and *Weis*, Mentz, 1820; then by *Lacroix*, Paris, 1845; and again, *in Latin and German, by Dr. *Haas*, Tueb., 1860. This much discussed and greatly overrated production must not be mistaken for an exposition of his private belief (*privata fidei suæ expositio*); it being only a statement of the concessions which, in the opinion of *Leibnitz*, Protestants might well make and Catholics accept. Moreover, Leibnitz, though perfectly conscious of the truth, was so far from making open profession of it, that, in 1708, he wrote as follows to Fabricius of Helmstaedt: "Our (Hanover's) whole title to the crown of Great Britain rests solely on our rejection and hatred of the religion of Rome. Hence *we must carefully avoid whatever might be construed into connivance by us at the claims of the Roman Catholic Church.*" Cf. the latest discussion on this work in the *Tueb. Quarterly*, 1848, p. 46 sq., and the latest edition of the works of *Leibnitz*, by *Foucher de Careil*, Paris, 1859, sq., T. I., in which there are now to be found 125, instead of the former 36 letters, exchanged by Bossuet and Leibnitz on religious reunion. Cf. *Haffner*, Leibnitz and His Efforts for Reunion in Science, Politics, and Religion. (The "*Catholic*," 1864, Vol. I., p. 513 sq.)

[3] *Bossuet*, Projet de réunion des Protestants de France et d'Allemagne à l'église catholique (Œuvres; nouv. edit., Par., 1836 T. VII., p. 309-584). Concerning later attempts of reunion, made by *Klüpfel* and *Stattler*, see *Huth*, L. cit., Vol. II., p. 746 sq.

ments that in separating themselves from the Catholic Church the great bulk of them took the step in ignorance, rather than with a full knowledge of what they were doing.[1] In consequence, many of the German princes, seeing and acknowledging their mistake, to the great joy of Holy Mother Church, returned to the unity of faith. Among these were *Ernest*, Landgrave *of Hesse* (1652); *John Frederic of Brunswick*, then reigning Duke of Hanover (1651); *Frederic Augustus I.*, Elector of Saxony (1697); and *Charles Alexander*, Duke of Würtemberg (1712).

Others, again, like *Christian Augustus*, Duke of Holstein (1705), and the scholarly *Anthony Ulric* (1710) had the great joy of bringing their entire households with them.

But the joy these conversions gave the Church was tinged with sorrow, caused by the spread of the principles of the Hussites and Lutherans in the *territory of Salzburg*.[2] Again, the aggressive spirit of Protestants, on the occasion of the *second centenary celebration* of the outbreak of the Reformation, in the year 1717, was in painful contrast with the irenical temper shown by the noble and gifted men who had made the latest attempts at reunion. Seldom, if ever, had there been such an exhibition of intolerance, provocation, and insult as was then manifested towards Catholics by Protestants of every rank and condition.[3] The acrimonious, fierce, and at times coarse character that marked the controversial writings of *Nicholas Weislinger* († 1775),[4] during the latter years of his life parish priest of Cappel-Rodeck, in the territory of Baden, are in a measure excusable, in that they were used in meeting a still more atrocious method of warfare on the part of Protestants, and were expressive of the indignation the author naturally felt at "*seeing bishops and scholars silent in the face of insults the most stinging and calumnies the most foul.*" One as clever as he in the field of controversy, and as conversant with the writings of the Reformers, might confidently reply to those who reproached him with having written scurrilously, "that the wanton and indecent language and the scandalous blasphemies to be found in his writings were not of his own coinage." "They have," he added, "been extracted from the works of Luther and his partisans, whose words I have uniformly quoted, giving references to where the passages may be had. Seek and you shall find."

A movement antagonistic to the traditional methods of ecclesi-

[1] Œuvres; nouv. édit., T. V., p. 566 et suiv. et Histoire des Variations, 2 vols. in 12mo, Paris, Sarlit.

[2] See below, § 384.

[3] Ibid.

[4] The numerous writings of Weislinger are: "*Friss Vogel oder stirb*"—"*Neck or Nothing*," 1723, and frequently; *Huttenus delarvatus*, 1730; "Choice Curiosities of Old and New *Theological Quackery*," 1738; "The *Lutheran Saint Unmasked*," 1756; Armamentarium Catholicum, 1746; and many more. Cf. *Alzog*, John Nicholas Weislinger, Pastor of Capell, below Rodeck, in the territory of Brisgovia; being an essay to serve for a better acquaintance with his personality and literary activity (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Freiburg, 1865, Vol. I.).

astical government, and more or less affecting every branch of ecclesiastical life, began about this time to give tokens of its presence. Its rise may be traced to a number of causes, but among the most potent was the establishment of *papal nunciatures* in *Vienna* (1581), *Cologne* (1582), *Lucerne* (1586), *Brussels* (1588), and *Munich* (1585). These were established for two objects: firstly, to guard the interests of the Church against the dangers of Protestantism; and, secondly, to render ecclesiastical administration more easy and efficient. The bishops regarded the extent of jurisdiction granted to the nuncios of the above cities as a trespass upon their rights, which they determined to defend at every hazard.[1] But on this subject we shall again have occasion to speak.

A still more potent cause of the movement was the influence of French literature, then coming into favour in Germany. The first and most conspicuous evidence of its effects was given in a work by *John Nicholas von Hontheim*, coadjutor Bishop of Treves. Writing under the name of *Justinus Febronius*, he published his book *On the State of the Church and the Legitimate Authority of the Roman Pontiff*,[2] in which he endeavoured to show the Germans by historical arguments that the Gallican Articles were defensible, and that the Pope had no right to interfere in the local discipline and church government of individual dioceses, thus restricting, still more than the Liberties had done, the *essential* jurisdiction of the Holy See. He held that the Pope is in precisely the same relation to the bishops that the presiding officer is to the members of a parliament; that the true constitution of the Church is not *monarchical;* and that the *Church*, and not *Christ*, invested the Bishop of Rome with the Primacy he enjoys. The Pope indeed has *authority*, but not *jurisdiction*, over the Universal Church.

While freely admitting that the Primacy of the Holy See had

[1] *A. Menzel* (Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. I., p. 303 sq.; 2nd ed., Vol. VI., p. 218 sq.) makes some curious disclosures concerning the controversy occasioned by these nunciatures. He says: "Pope *Pius VI.* having requested King William II. of Prussia to protect the papal authority against the encroachments of the Rhenish archbishops, published a comprehensive reply (*Responsio*), laying the state of the controversy with the archbishops before the public, in the course of which he administers to them the following sharp rebuke: 'I am informed,' he says, 'that the extreme corruption prevalent in certain dioceses has become a subject of complaint, and its source is traced to the acts of oppression practised by the Roman Court. It is a common strategy with schismatics, with a view to imposing upon the inexperienced, to slanderously charge the Apostolic See with moral disorders, the existence of which they cannot deny, and then to promise a reformation, forgetful that every reform must begin with one's self. If the nuncios are not hindered in the exercise of their jurisdiction, and the archbishops, as in duty bound, honour and duly obey the First See, and conjointly with the nuncios see to it that the wholesome laws and canons of the Council of Trent be properly enforced, the existing evils will be corrected, even without calling diocesan synods, and the disorders of which the counsellors now complain will disappear from the sees of archbishops and bishops.'"

[2] Justini Febronii de statu eccl. et legitima potestate Rom. Pontif. liber singularis ad reuniendos in relig. christianos compositus, Bouillon, 1763, 4to. (Frkft. on the Main); German transl., Wardingen, 1764. Cf. *Huth*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 438 sq. *Walch*, Latest Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., pp. 145-198; *Otto Mejer*, Supplements to the Romano-German Question, Rostock, 1871.

been established to preserve the unity of the Church, Febronius failed to see that the principles he advanced and the advice he volunteered to the Church and to civil princes necessarily tended to destroy it. So unfair, not to say dishonest, were the constructions put by Febronius upon certain facts of Church History, that *Lessing*,[1] an author not open to the suspicion of partiality, thus comments on his methods: "The opinions of Febronius and his partisans are only a base flattery of princes; the proofs brought forward by him against the rights of the Pope are utterly worthless; or, if they are to be received at all, they tell with double and threefold force against the rights of princes as opposed to those of bishops. This is so evident that nothing could be more so, and I am only astonished that it has never occurred to anyone to characterize the opinions of Febronius with the severity they deserve."

John von Mueller, although a Protestant, in his *Journeys of the Popes*, also undertook the vindication of historic truth in this matter. *Hontheim's* writings called forth many refutations, among which may be mentioned those of *Zaccaria*, *Viator de Coccaglia*, *Mamachi*, *Peter Ballerini*, and Professor *Kauffmann* of Cologne, all remarkable for thorough and scholarly historical criticism. *Clement XIII.* condemned the Book of Febronius, and ordered its suppression by all the bishops of Germany. The author's archbishop besought him to retract the errors it contained, which he did in the year 1778.

Pius VI. expressed the pleasure the retractation gave him in a Consistory of Cardinals,[2] but was soon pained to learn that Hontheim had handed his archbishop an explanation, accompanied with a *Commentary* (1781), both of which went to show that his act of submission had been insincere. The teachings set forth in the *Commentary* had, unfortunately, a wide and deplorable influence in forming public opinion with regard to the rights of the Holy See. This was especially noticeable in the works of *Valentine Eybel*, a canonist of Vienna; of *Theophorus Ries*, Director of studies to the Archbishop of Mentz; of the brothers *Riegger;* and even of *Rautenstrauch*, who wrote a childish, servile, and uncatholic tract, entitled, *A Representation to His Holiness*, which the inhabitants of Vienna had the good sense and Catholic instinct to treat with the contempt it deserved.

An effort was made at the same time to prejudice public opinion against *monasticism;* and while its most decided adversaries condemned it outright, the more moderate questioned its usefulness. *Joseph II.*, that paragon of philanthropic enthusiasts, who had always more benevolent designs in his head than he well knew what to do

[1] *Fred. Henry Jacobi*, Complete Works, Vol. II., p. 334.

[2] "Agnovit (*Hontheim*), commentis suis obsistere atque adversari Christi doctrinam, Patrum testimonia, Conciliorum decreta aliasque ecclesiasticas sanctiones. Non temporali commodo illectus, non virium infirmitate fractus, non ingenio debilitatus, nec molestis inductus suasionibus, sed sola veritatis agnitione permotus." Concerning the whole, cf. *Huth*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 438-458. * New elucidations in Gesta Trevirorum, integra lectionum varietate et animadversionibus illustrata ac indice duplici instructa, nunc primum edidit *J. H. Wyttenbach* et *Müller*, Trevir., 1836 sq., T. III., p. 296 sq. Thirteen pieces, cf. "*The Catholic*," 1842, January number, pp. 89-93, and Card. *Litta*, quoted above.

with, desirous of placing the Church under the tutelage of the State, did his best to convert priests into bureaucrats, and civil officers into ecclesiastical judges. In identifying Church and State, his ordinances concerning the former were so Protestant in character "*that in effect they virtually amounted to a suspension of the Catholic Church.*"

To give himself the airs of a liberal Catholic, Joseph II. permitted full liberty of inquiry, and made the *press* nearly, if not quite, *free;* although it was evident that no such thing as *unrestricted* intellectual investigation was possible where both Church and State were in a condition of a degrading servitude. A host of writers at once started up, who set themselves to traduce the Catholic Church and her institutions, and to proclaim that the golden age had dawned. At their head was *Aloysius Blumauer*, who having been expelled from the Society of Jesus, was now an ardent Freemason; *Eybel*, the canonist, and many more, whose intolerably stupid productions brought the calling of *literature* itself into disrepute.

With a view to propagating the *new learning* more rapidly and more effectually, the emperor had abolished the seminaries in the various dioceses, and in their stead opened five *general* ones in the cities of Vienne, Pesth, Freiburg (1783), Pavia, and Louvain. To these were affiliated the seminaries of Prague, Olmütz, Gratz, Innspruck, and Luxemburg, and the chairs in both were filled by theologians of *enlightenment* and culture. This arrangement, it was said, would more than compensate for the abolition of private institutions, by encouraging, through the relations of the General Seminaries to the Universities, a healthy rivalry in study. To every man of judgment the defect of this plan was apparent, for in withdrawing the seminarists from the eyes of their several bishops, it took from the latter the means of knowing whether or not they possessed either the learning or virtue requisite in aspirants for the priesthood. Joseph II., who carried his interference in ecclesiastical affairs so far as to prescribe the ceremonies for public worship and give instruction in liturgical matters, was facetiously called by Frederic the Great "*My Brother the Sacristan.*" In the year 1783 he published a silly and contemptible ordinance regulating divine worship; and in 1786 prescribed that the German language should be used in the liturgy. He, however, forebore to abolish the celibacy. All these measures were intended to make ecclesiastical discipline a sort of dignified system of police; and when the bishops raised their voices in emphatic protest against such a degradation of a holy thing, he charged them with being both stubborn and stupid.

But that the faith was still deeply seated in the hearts of the people, and that both they and the clergy were warmly attached to the Holy See, was amply attested on the occasion of the visit of *Pius VI.* to Vienna. Their murmurs against the *reformatory* measures, which were steadily clothing them with the vesture of *Protestantism*, though at first muttered only in whispers, grew at last plainly audible, and in Belgium the discontent became so intense that the inhabitants rose in open revolt against the emperor.

Joseph II, died of a broken heart, February 20, 1790, without having had time to repent of his efforts to crush out the Christian faith in the hearts of his subjects, and to sow in its room the seeds of revolutionary strife. At his last Communion he protested that in all the ordinances he had published during the nine years of his reign, he had always had the welfare of his people in view. By his death he was spared the humiliation of having to revoke the ordinances already published in Belgium. If a General Seminary was not established in this country, the credit is due to the manly and firm stand taken by *Frankenberg*, the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines, who baffled the emperor's design by the publication of his *Doctrinal Declaration*. The Austrian canonists were guilty of a very grievous fault by pretending to extend the *jus circa sacra* to a *jus in sacra*, thus encouraging Joseph II. in his iniquitous course. He was also encouraged by the electors of *Mentz*, *Treves*, and *Cologne*, the last of whom was his own brother, the Archduke Maximilian, and by the Archbishop of *Salzburg*, all of whom desired to be independent of Rome, to abolish the papal nunciatures, and to establish a *German National Church*.

At the very time that these bishops were endeavouring to get rid of the Papal Nuncios, *Charles Theodore*, Elector Palatine of Bavaria, owing to the peculiar condition of the Church in his States, was using his efforts to have a nunciature permanently established in Munich.[1] *Zoglio* was appointed to the position (1785), to whom the elector ordered the ecclesiastics of his dominions to have recourse in future for all matters within his competency. Even before the arrival of the Nuncio, the bishops addressed a spirited protest to the Pope, which, being unsuccessful, they appealed for aid to Joseph II., who promised to come to their relief (1785). In consequence, the three electors and the Archbishop of Salzburg came together, forming the notorious *Congress of Ems* (1786), and drew up a *protest in twenty-three articles*, known as the *Punctuation of Ems*,[2] in which they insisted on their absolute and unrestricted episcopal authority, declaring: 1. That as bishops they had no need of consulting Rome; 2. That they of their own authority might dispense in matrimonial impediments to the second degree; 3. That all bulls and briefs emanating from the Holy See might or might not be accepted by bishops, according to their judgment; 4. That the revenues of the pallium and annates should be abolished, and a reasonable tax levied instead; 5. That for disposing of cases of appeal the Pope should

[1] Pragmatic History of the Nunciature at Munich, Frkft., 1787. *Aquilin Cæsar*, History of the Nunciatures in Germany, 1790. *Huth*, L. cit., Vol. II., pp. 468-490; and *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchdom in Germany, Schaffhausen, 1851. p. 736; *Marx*, Hist. of Treves.

[2] Conf. *Huth*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 491-500. See the Reports of the Congress in *Buss*, L. c., p. 738 sq.; in *Münch's* Collection of Old and New Concordats, Pt. I., pp. 404-423. The Congress of Ems, according to Authentic Documents, Frkft. and Lps., 1787, 4to. *Pacca*, Historical Reminiscences of his Sojourn in Germany, 1786-1794; Germ., Augsburg, 1832, in the Appendix on Nuncios, together with historical documents, pp. 145-215. *Walch*, Latest Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., pp. 337-388.

appoint delegate judges (*judices in partibus*), or establish a provincial synod; and 6. That bishops, having been again restored to their primitive rights, should have power to introduce improvements in ecclesiastical discipline.[1]

The *Punctuation* was sent to Joseph II., who gave it his hearty approval, adding that there was no question but that the issue would be ultimately successful, if only the *bishops* could be brought to share the sentiments of the *archbishops* on the questions involved. Of this, however, there was no reasonable possibility; on the contrary, the Bishop of Spire at once told the Elector of Mentz that many of the articles of the *Punctuation* must be rejected, and that, in his opinion, it was utterly impossible to strip the Holy See of rights it had indisputably exercised for above a thousand years. His example was followed by the Bishop of Würzburg, a brother of the Elector of Mentz, and by many more, who gave notable evidence of their loyalty to the Holy See when *Pacca*, the Papal Nuncio, published a circular letter, addressed to all priests having care of souls, warning them that the archbishops had no jurisdiction to grant dispensations reserved to the Holy See, and that if such were granted they would be null and void. This caused the Elector of Treves to waver, and, in 1787, he petitioned the Pope for faculties for the diocese of Augsburg, to hold good for five years. The Elector of Mentz was next to make advances, requesting the Holy See to confirm the appointment of *Baron de Dalberg* as his coadjutor. Finally, the three electors together disavowed their former action, declaring that they had nothing more at heart than the settlement of the unfortunate differences between themselves and the Holy See, and acknowledging its right to send nuncios to Germany and to grant dispensations (1789). In reply, Pope Pius VI., after congratulating them on their change of mind, gave a firm, but temperate statement of the grounds on which his rights were based. The letter is a masterpiece of its kind.[2]

§ 371. *Literary Activity—Unbelief—Superstition.*

Thesaurus librorum rei Catholicæ, Würzburg, 1848, 2 vols. *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theology since the Council of Trent (especially in Germany).

These ecclesiastico-political events, as has been already remarked, had a deep influence on general literature and theological studies. Down to the middle of the eighteenth century, German writers on theology confined their labours to its two leading branches, viz., *Scholastic Theology* and *Canon Law*. The questions in dispute between the Thomists and Scotists were mainly discussed by the two rival schools of the Benedictines and Jesuits. *Patrick Sporer*, a

[1] But how little these improvements were to be expected was evident from the Fawns and Satyrs which figured so conspicuously in the decorations of the episcopal palaces in Würzburg, Mentz, and Bühl, near Bonn.

[2] Sanctissimi Dom. nostri Pii Papæ VI. responsio ad Metropolitanos Moguntinum. Trevirens., Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis Apostol., Rom., 1789.

Franciscan († 1681),[1] and particularly *James Busenbaum* a Jesuit († 1668),[2] introduced an important change in the study of Canon Law by separating from it what properly belonged to the domain of Moral Theology. A similar change took place in dogmatics. Scholastic theology was *simplified* by being cleared of its elaborate system of formulas, its endless distinctions, and refined subleties. These tendencies were pushed still further by *Eusebius Amort*,[3] a canon regular of St. Augustine († 1775), who, standing, as it were, on the boundary that marked the decline of Speculative Scholasticism and the rise of modern positive theology, is the most important author of that age.[4] With a view to give to theological studies a wider range, and to better adapt them to the needs of the times, special attention was given to institutions where the higher branches of theology were cultivated. This solicitude was all the more necessary now that the suppression of the Society of Jesus, whose members had filled nearly all the faculties of theology, rendered important reforms imperative. The first movement towards widening the range of theological studies was made in Austria during the reign of *Maria Teresa*, on the secret advice of *Van Switen;* and it was at once noticeable that the movement was accompanied by an uncatholic spirit and a tendency hostile to the rights of the Church, both of which the Jesuits strenuously opposed until the day of their suppression.

At the earnest solicitation of *Trautson*, Archbishop of Vienna, and *Ambrose Stock*, one of his suffragan bishops, the Austrian Government included, among the branches of the theological curriculum the *interpretation of Holy Scripture* according to the original Hebrew and Greek texts.

Under *Rautenstrauch*, Abbot of Braunau, and from 1774 Rector of the Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna, special chairs were founded for *Biblical Exegetics* and its cognate branches, and also for *Church History*, *Patrology*, and *Pastoral Theology*, and to this day the same plan of studies is observed. Unfortunately, the direction of the whole course of studies was committed by Joseph II. to Baron *Godfrey van Switen*, who was in active correspondence with the French and German philosophers of that age, and particularly

[1] The following biographical notices of celebrated moralists have been taken from *M. Haringer*, C.SS.R., Index Scriptorum: **Sporer*, Patritius, Germanus, Passaviensis, Ord. St. Francisci, definitor sui ordinis. St. Alphonsus says of him, that in his decisions he was very fair, and, perhaps, sometimes rather too mild. (Tr.) His work was entitled Theologia moralis super decalogum.

[2] *Busenbaum*, Hermannus, Germanus, S. J., rector collegii Hildesiensis. Medulla theologiæ moralis, of which there appeared forty-five editions, from 1645-1670.

[3] *Amort*, Eusebius, Germanus, canonicus regularis Pollingæ et S. Joannis Lateranensis; theologus episc. Augustani, a S. Alphonso sæpius laudatus ut vir pro suis variis operibus undequaque perspectus. Suam theologiam moralem et scholasticam non nisi prius a Benedicto XIV. recognitam typis mandavit. Egregie defendit probabilismum, sed in quæstionibus practicis multo severior quam S. Alphonsus extitit. Tr. fr. *Ballerini's* Index Scriptorum, ed Rom., 1869, p. XII. His work, Theologia moralis et scholastica, Asugutæ Vindelicor., 1752 sq., 23 T., 8vo.

Cf. Thesaurus libror. catholicor. Vol. I., p. 13, 14, and *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol., pp. 96-174, and many other places.

with those of Berlin and the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht. Through his influence and by his authority, the pretentious and superficial acquirements, which were regarded as essential to what was called enlightenment, were made to form part of the new course of theological studies, and soon became fashionable in the *General Seminaries*, from which, being establishments of the Government, all episcopal interference was excluded.[1] From Prague and Vienna this spirit of rationalism and false enlightenment spread to the universities and seminaries in other cities, everywhere infecting the faculties of philosophy and theology. The professors, discarding the philosophy of Aristotle, constructed their systems of dogmatic and moral theology on that of Kant and Fichte. The theological faculty of *Freiburg*, under Dannenmayer, Klüpfel, and Wanker (from 1788), that of *Würzburg*, under *Oberthür*, Onymus, *Francis Berg*,[2] and Barthel; that of Ingolstadt, and, still later, those of Dillingen and Landshut, all gave evidence of extraordinary literary activity, which was, *in a measure at least*, inspired by excellent motives. At *Treves*, the hot-bed of Febronianism, and at *Mentz*, *Heidelberg*, and *Bonn*,[3] a spirit of rationalism, leading straight to Protestantism, and having other tendencies equally dangerous and destructive, was openly and defiantly avowed. *Baron* Charles of *Erthal*, the last Elector of Mentz, suffered himself to be completely converted to this rationalistic and spurious enlightenment by the fulsome flattery that was skilfully lavished upon him, and in his zeal to promote its advancement endeavoured to reform the university of that city by filling its professorships with men, whether Protestant or Catholic, known to be favourable to the new learning. His brother, *Francis Louis of Erthal*, Prince Bishop of Würzburg, who was incomparably his superior in both prudence and virtue, laboured in vain to dissuade him from his rash purpose. Orthodoxy was daily losing ground, and it was not long until rationalism was completely triumphant.

Affairs were in a still more deplorable condition at the Academy of *Bonn*, which the brother of Joseph II., *Maximilian Francis*, Arch-

[1] Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., pp. 1023-1046; Fr. trans., Vol. 25, art. "Vienne."

[2] *Schwab*, Francis Berg, Ecclesiastical Counsellor and Professor of Ch. H. at the University of Würzburg, being a Supplement to the Age of Enlightenment, Würzburg, 1869 (a carefully written and instructive monography).

[3] †*Brück*, The Rationalistic Tendencies in Catholic Germany, especially in the Three Rhenish Archbishoprics during the second half of the Eighteenth Century, Mentz, 1865. Among others the physiologist, *Rudolph Wagner*, gives a curious account of the policy of the Court of Mentz towards the close of the last century. The leaders of the intellectual movement were the Elector Frederic Charles; Dalberg, his coadjutor; and the powerful minister Albani. It was indeed a most peculiar age, when an ecclesiastical elector could invite a number of Protestants to the university of his capital, one of whom he made his confidant and sent to Rome, the centre of Catholic Christendom, on a mission to the Holy Father. There was also quite a brilliant galaxy of influential ladies at this court, all of whom interested themselves, after their own fashion, in promoting literature and art. It was at this time that Heinse read his Ardinghello to the Elector and Madame de Coudenhofen. (*Rudolph Wagner*, Biography of Samuel von Soemmering, Professor of Anatomy at Cassel, and afterwards at Mentz; died 1830 at Frankfort.

bishop Elector, acting under the advice of the Illuminati, raised, in 1786, to the rank of a university, that it might counteract the influence of the University of Cologne. One of the professors of this seat of learning, who received his appointment in the face of numerous protests, was *Eulogius Schneider*, who as a student had been expelled from Würzburg for immoral conduct. He was a thorough Socinian, weak and inconstant in character, an advocate of the religion of nature, and a fanatical revolutionist. After assisting in carting the guillotine around from place to place to chop off other people's heads, he ended by having his own taken off with the same instrument of death at Strasburg, April 10, 1794. When such influences were at work it is not surprising that the new method of learning, dominated as it was by utilitarian principles, produced a theology hostile in many respects to the spirit of the Church, and in no way remarkable for originality of thought or intellectual excellence. The best works produced in the domain of *dogmatics* were those of the Jesuit, *Benedict Stattler*,[1] of Ingolstadt, and the Augustinian, *Engelbert Klüpfel*,[2] a professor at Freiburg. The former, who was a deep and acute thinker, treated the subject more or less in detail; the latter published only a compendium. *Michael Sailer*, a man equally eminent for ability and virtue, rendered the following tribute to the memory of Stattler: "At this time," he says, "there appeared in Germany a man who taught us to think for ourselves, and, starting with the most elementary propositions of philosophy, to rigorously follow out the line of thought they opened up to its last conclusions in theology. To him, as in gratitude bound, myself and many more ascribe whatever of ability we possess to think independently, and without being unduly influenced by the opinions of others." The theological teachings of Stattler, however, were not entirely above suspicion, many of his most important works having been censured by the Holy See.[3] As to Klüpfel, his works have been in constant use in Austria down to our own day, and this fact alone is a sufficient guarantee of their merit. The same may be said of the larger and smaller dogmatical works of the Cistercian, *Wiest*, both of which are clearly written, and give evidence of an intimate knowledge of the subject in hand. He also wrote on patrology and on the history of Christian literature. The large and valuable work of the Dominican, *Gazzaniga*,[4] a pro-

[1] *Stattler*, Demonstratio evangelica, Aug. Vind., 1771: Demonstratio cath., Pappenh., 1775; Theologia christ. theoretica. Ingolst., 1776, VI. T.; General Doctrine of the Catholic Religion, Munich, 1793, 2 vols.

[2] *E. Klüpfel*, Institutt. theol. dogm. II. T., Vindob., 1789, ed. III. auctore Greg. Thom. Ziegler, Vien., 1821. Vinc. Lerin. commonitor., ed. Klüpfel, Vien., 1809. Bibliotheca ecclesiastica Friburgensis, fr. 1775-90 (Theological Review). Cf. *Hug*, Elogium Eng. Klüpfelii, Frib., 1811.

[3] Particularly the Demonstratio Catholica and Theologia Christiana theoretica. Cf. *Euth*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 434 and 454.

[4] *Wiest*, Institutiones (majores) theol., Ingolst., 1790-1801, 6 T. Institut. theolog. dogmat. in *usum academ.*, 2 T., 1791, and often. Introductio in historiam literariam theologiæ revelatæ, Ingolst., 1794; institutiones Patrologiæ, ibid., 1795. *Gazzaniga*, prælect. theol., 5 T., Vien., 1775.

fessor at Vienna, and the apologetical works of *Beda Mayr*, and *Storchenau* were all well received. The works of the learned and eminent *Martin Gerbert*,[1] Abbot of the Benedictine monastery at St. Blaise, in the Black Forest, treating chiefly of the *method* of studying theology, are deservedly held in high esteem († 1743). The inmates of St. Blaise continued to be distinguished for their scholarship and varied learning, even after the period of secularization, counting among their number such eminent men as Ussermann, Herrgott, and Neutgart. *Moral theology*, which had been treated too much after the manner of casuits by the Jesuits, *Busenbaum*, *Lacroix*, and *Voit*, not to speak of others, was now presented in a more direct and simple form by *Joseph Lauber*,[2] of Vienna, and *Augustine Zippe*,[3] of Prague. Their treatment, however, was also unsatisfactory, in that by eliminating dogmatic principles, which are necessarily the ground-work of all moral theology, they gave to their otherwise meritorious works an appearance of shallowness and want of solidity. *Stattler*,[4] *Schwarzhueber*, and *Danzer* were each superior to both of them, though in the writings of every one of these authors there is a noticeable absence of that high ethical standard which should characterize the works of every writer on Christian morality. They had a special fondness for introducing into their works the purely philosophical ideas of ancient and modern authors, which they adjusted as best they could to the principles of Christian ethics, and out of these two incongruous elements attempted to build up a system of morals in harmony at once with the tastes of the age and the requirements of the Church.

F. Christian Pitroff,[5] of Prague; *Giftschütz*, of Vienna; *Schwarzel*,[6] of Freiburg; and *Francis Geiger*,[7] a Bavarian, published works on Pastoral Theology. A religious and truly Catholic spirit was fostered *among the people* by the writings of the Jesuit, *Nakatenus* (*Heavenly*

[1] Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicam, institutioni tironum congregationis St. Blasii, Frib., 1754; principia theologiæ *exegeticæ*, St. Blas., 1757; de recto et perverso usu theologiæ scholasticæ, St. Blas., 1758; principia theol. *dogmaticæ* juxta seriem temporum et traditionis ecclesiasticæ digesta, St. Blas., 1758; principia theol. *symbolicæ*, ubi ordine symboli apostolici præcipua doctrinæ chr. capita explicantur, St. Blas., 1758, etc. Other principal works: Historia nigræ silvæ, St. Blas., 1783, 3 T., 4to; De musica sacra, St. Blas., 1774. Cf. *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theology, pp. 179-192.

[2] *J. Lauber*, A Short Manual of Christian Morality or Moral Theology, 5 pts., Vienna, 1785-1788.

[3] *A. Zippe*, A Key to a System of Ethics in accordance with Reason and Revelation, intended for the Private Instruction of Youth, Prague, 1778.

[4] *Stattler*, Ethica Christ. universalis et ethica Christ. communis, VI. T., Aug. Vind., 1782-1789. Complete Treatise on Christian Morals, for the Use of Families, Augsburg, 1789 sq. Catholic Ethics, or the Science of Happiness, based on Revelation and Philosophy, destined for the Higher Classes in Lyceums, Munich, 1791, 2 vols. *Schwarzhueber*, Practical Manual of the Catholic Religion, intended for reflecting Christians, Salzburg (1786), 1797 sq., 4 vols. *Danzer*, A Guide to Christian Morality, Salzburg (1787), 3rd edit., 1792-1803, 3 vols.

[5] *Pittroff*, Lessons of Practical Divinity, for the use of Academies, Prague, 1778-1779, 3 vols. Ecclesiastical Policy, Prague, 1785, 2 vols.

[6] *F. Giftschütz*, Elements of Pastoral Theology, 2 vols., Vienna, 1785; Lat. by *Klüpfel*, Vienna, 1789. *Schwarzel*, A Key to a Complete System of Pastoral Theology, Augsburg, 1799, 1800, 3 vols.

[7] *F. Geiger*, Pastoral Lessons on the Duties of a Parish Priest, Augsb., 1789.

Palm Grove, also in Latin, *Cœleste Palmetum*, 1660); of the Premonstratensian, *Leonard Goffine*, who dwelt on the banks of the Lower Rhine (*Hand-Postil*, 1690, † 1719); and of the Capuchin, *Martin Cochem*, whose simple manners and dignified bearing won the confidence and commanded the respect of all who approached him. He dwelt on the banks of the Moselle, and died in the year 1712.

Abraham-a-Sancta-Clara (Ulrich Megerle),[1] an Augustinian, was a man of great originality of thought, extensive information, grotesque humour, never-failing wit, and homely, though vigorous language; and, after his appointment as court preacher at Vienna, lashed the follies of all classes of society with commendable freedom and admirable intrepidity. Of the numerous writers on ecclesiastical history it will suffice to mention *Pohl*, a Jesuit, and *Stoeger*, both of Vienna; *Gaspar Royko*, of Prague; and *Dannenmayr*, a professor at Freiburg, and afterwards at Vienna. The collections of German councils by *Schannat*, *Harzheim*, and others; the *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, published in six volumes, folio, at Augsburg in 1521; and the works of *Bernard Pez*, a Benedictine of the monastery of Melk, were all valuable contributions to Church history. The last-named author was assisted in his labours by his younger brother, *Jerome Pez*, whose edition of the *Scriptores rerum Austriacarum*, published in three volumes, folio, at Leipsig in 1721, made him famous. The compilation of the results of the labours performed by the members of the French Congregation of St. Maur in patristic studies has a merit peculiarly its own. It was accomplished by the Benedictine, *Dominic Schramm*, of Banz (*Analysis Patrum*, as far as St. Augustine, 18 vols., 8vo); *Placidus Sprenger*, of Würzburg (*Thesaurus rei patristicæ seu Dissertationes præstantiores*, etc., 3 vols., 4to); and by *Bernard Marschall* and *Godfrey Lumper*, of St. George's, near Villingen. Of the two last the former was the author of a *Concordia Ss. Patrum eccles. Græc. et Latin.*, 2 vols., folio; and the latter of a *Historia theologica de vita et scriptis Ss. Patrum*, 13 vols., octavo. The first, though rather unsuccessful attempt at writing a patrology, was made by *Wilhelm*, a professor at Freiburg (*Patrologia in usus academicos*, 1775). There were numerous writers on *Canon Law*, all of whom, in the treatment of the subject, pursued the *traditional* methods. The following are the more eminent: *Engel*, a Benedictine, of Salzburg (*Collegium universi juris canonici*, Salisb., 1671, ed XV., 1770, 3 vols.); *Pirhing* (*Jus canonicum*, Dilling., 1675, 5 vols., fol., ed. nov., Venet., 1727, fol.); *Anacletus Reiffenstuel*, O. S. F. Minor. (*Jus canonicum universum juxta titulos librorum V. decretalium*, Monachii, 1702; Romæ, 1831, 6 vols.); *James Wiestner* (*Institut. canon. sive jus. eccl. ad Decret. Gregor. IX. libros quinque*, Monachii, 1705, 5 vols., 4to); *Fr. Schmier* (*Jurisprudentia canonico-civilis seu Jus canonicum universum juxta libros V. Decret.*, Salisb., 1716, 3 vols.); the Jesuits, *Fr. Schmalzgrueber* (*Jus eccles. universale*, Ingolst., 1726, 5 vols., fol.;

[1] *Th. G. of Karajan*, Abraham-a-Santa-Clara, Vienna, 1867.

Romæ, 1843, 12 bindings, 4to); *Biner* (*Apparatus eruditionis ad jurisprudentiam præsertim eccles.*, 1754, etc., 13 T., 4to); the Piarist, *Remigius Maschat* (new edit., Florence, 1854, 4 vols., with a *Gallican* tendency); *Bern van Espen* (*Jus eccl. univ.*, Colon. Agripp., 1702, fol.; Mogunt., 1791, 3 vols.); *Greg. Zallwein*, in a Gallican *Josephist*, but still moderate spirit (*Principia juris eccles. univ. et particularis Germaniæ*, 1763, 4 T., 4to; Aug. Vind., 1781, 5 vols., 4to; 1831, 5 vols.); and *Gaspar Barthel*, the Würzburg Canonist.

As time went on it became clear that the true Catholic spirit was gradually but steadily dying out, and that the negative influence of Protestantism was beginning to appear in the writings of many of the Catholic theologians. *Blau*, a professor of theology at Mentz, went so far as to call in question the infallibility of the representatives of the Church assembled in general council.[1] *Lawrence Isenbiehl*,[2] of Eichsfeld, who had been sent by Emmerich Joseph, Elector of Mentz, to Goettingen to complete his studies in Oriental literature, expressed his doubts as to the Messianic prophecy of Isaias vii. 14, denying that it contained any reference to the Messiah. His opinions were submitted to the judgment of many of the theological faculties, and returned with notes of censure attached; and his *New Essay on the Prophecy concerning Emmanuel*, which appeared without either the printer's name or the required legal authorization, was condemned by Pope Pius VI. (September 2, 1779) as containing doctrines and propositions erroneous, rash, dangerous, favouring heresy, and even heretical. Isenbiehl, who had been in the first instance treated with unnecessary severity, now retracted his errors, and was appointed by his archbishop to a benefice at Amoeneburg.

Steinbühler, a jurist of Strasburg, ridiculed the ceremonies of the Church, but his blasphemous utterances were dearly expiated by the persecution he underwent (1781). The extreme of atheistic free thought was reached in the principles professed by the *Order of the Illuminati*,[3] already mentioned. It was founded, May 1, 1776, by *Weishaupt*, a professor of canon law at Ingolstadt. Its members were told that after having passed through the degrees of *Magus* and *Rex*, or priest and regent, they would arrive at the full light of knowledge. The Illuminism of Weishaupt was a mixture of French atheism and German freemasonry, and its aim "the abolition of priestcraft and knavery, and the extermination of the wicked (that is, of priests and princes) from the face of the earth." The Illuminati endeavoured to have men in full sympathy with them put into every position of trust in both Church and State. They aimed at giving

[1] Critical History on Ecclesiastical Infallibility, to Serve as an Aid for a Free Investigation of Catholicism, Frkft., 1791.

[2] Cf. *Huth*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 358-369. *Walch*, L. c., Pt. VIII., pp. 9-88.

[3] On the Order of the Illuminati in Germany, 1792. Some Original Writings of the Order of the Illuminati, by order of the supreme authority, Munich, 1787. *Weishaupt*, The Improved System of the Illuminati, with all its Grades and Institutions, Frkft., 1788. (*Weishaupt*, Hist. of the Persecution of the Illuminati, Frkft. and Lps., 1786.)

priests to the altar, counsellors to princes, professors to universities, and commanders to the fortresses of the empire.[1]

Nicolai and *Biester*, of Berlin, and their co-labourers in the preparation of the *German Universal Library*, were the next to propagate the principles and spread the Order of the Illuminati. The Government of Bavaria, after inquiring into the character and methods of the new organization, ordered its suppression in 1784. It, however, continued to exist and to extend the scope of its pernicious influence. As an illustration of the saying that extremes meet, nearly simultaneously with the Illuminati, *Gassner*,[2] the parish priest at Ellwangen, became famous in the year 1774 for his powers of exorcism and his gift of healing all manner of diseases in the name of Jesus. From all parts of Germany Protestants and Catholics came crowding about him to receive of such benefits as he had to impart, but as a rule returned home heartily ashamed of their credulity, and as sick and infirm as they were before seeing him. *Jerome* of *Coloredo*, Archbishop of Salzburg, issued a charge to his flock, condemning these pretended cures, in the course of which he said: "An attempt has been made in our day to introduce a new method of healing diseases, which, whether in principle or in practice, no child of the Church can regard as other than dangerous and worthy of condemnation." Gassner's conduct was also censured by both the emperor and the Pope.

§ 372. *Political and Religious Disturbances in Poland.*

Friese, Ch. H. of Poland, Pt. II., Vol. II. *Huth*, L. cit., Vol. II., pp. 233-241. *Walch*, New Hist. of Religion, Vol. IV., pp. 1-208; Vol. VII., pp. 3-160.

In no country had *Dissenters*, from whatever religious party they came, been so freely received and so generously tolerated as in Poland. By concessions granted successively in the years 1569, 1573, 1576, and 1587, their rights were augmented, their prerogatives extended, and their liberties widened.[3] Their pretensions increased as their liberties grew, and once in possession of the latter, they assumed towards Catholics a bearing of superiority strangely contrasting with the humbleness of their origin and the disabilities of their former condition. The consequence was that a decided reaction set in against them on the part of Catholics, beginning with the reign of Sigismund III.

By decrees of the Diets held in 1717 and 1733, numerous restrictions were put upon the civil and religious freedom they had formerly enjoyed, and the Consistory of Posen (1743) forbade Lutheran ministers to either baptize or instruct children born of mixed mar-

[1] Concerning the efforts of the German freethinkers, now kept in check, see the remarkable memorial by *Gfroerer* (Review of Historical Theology, edited by *Illgen*, Vol. VI. Lps., 1836).

[2] *Huth*, L. c., Vol. VII., pp. 388-397. *Walch*, Pt. VI., p. 364 sq.

[3] *Jus dissidentium* in regno Poloniæ. Scrutinium juris in re et ad rem theologico juridicum, Vars., 1736, f., pp. 192-256.

riages. These measures were provoked by the action of the Lutheran magistracy of the Protestant city of *Thorn*, which had repeatedly denied to its Catholic inhabitants rights to which they were plainly and justly entitled, and had declined to pay any attention to their lawful petitions. The long pent-up anger of both parties finally broke out into open violence on the 10th of July, 1724, when a mob, after dispersing a Catholic procession, proceeded to pull down the college of the Jesuits.[1] The affair was investigated, and *Roesner*, the burgomaster; *Zernike*, the vice-president, and nine burghers were condemned, and, despite the intercession of *Santini*, the Papal Nuncio, with King Augustus at Warsaw, all, with the exception of Zernike, executed. The Diet of Pacification, convoked in 1736, to provide measures for the public safety, seriously threatened by the Dissidents, gave them the fullest assurances of peace, secured them in their possessions, and confirmed their claims to equal civil rights, only forbidding them to hold political assemblies or invoke the aid of foreign princes. In defiance of this prohibition, two Lithuanians, the brothers *Grabowski*, and two Poles, the brothers *Golz*, made an offer of the crown of Poland to *Frederic Christian*, *Elector of Saxony* After his death, however, they deemed it more advantageous to join the Russo-Prussian party, lately formed in Poland.

Taught by costly experience, the Diet of 1766, in which *Ladislaus Lubienski*, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, delivered a speech remarkable for energy and power, confirmed all the general laws enacted against the Dissidents in the years 1717, 1733, 1736, and 1747. Both Russia and Prussia, yielding to the frequent and urgent solicitations of the Dissidents, seized upon this action of the Diet as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of Poland. They also endeavoured to make the Courts of France and Sweden partners to their design.[2] From the 15th of October, 1767, the influence of Russian despotism was supreme in the Diet of Warsaw. All orators, whether Catholics or Dissidents, who displayed any zeal in opposing the policy of Russia, were seized and carried off prisoners to that country; and Poland, acting from motives of fear rather than from the dictates of wisdom, concluded a treaty with the government of the Tsar, by which, while the Catholic was to be the religion of the State, and professed by the king, the Dissidents were to have all the religious and civil rights enjoyed in the year 1717 restored to them. The Diet of 1786 went still further, extending the rights of Protestants, restricting those of Catholics, and interfering generally in purely ecclesiastical affairs.

The bishops having applied to the Holy See for instructions

[1] (*Jablonski*), The Troubles of Thorn, Berlin, 1725. Cf. Chronicle of Thorn, *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. X., pp. 953-957; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 417 sq.

[2] Cf. *Janssen*, Supplements serving to elucidate the causes that contributed to the first partition of Poland, Freiburg, 1865. The author states, on page 184, "that Bishop *Soltik* had warned the Dissidents against this step, saying that foreign powers used *religious questions* only as a pretext, their real design being to kindle the flames of civil war in Poland, and thus divide the country."

regarding the question arising out of marriages between Catholics and Dissidents and Catholics and separated Greeks, received in reply from *Benedict XIV.* the bull *Magnæ nobis admirationis*, setting forth that such marriages could not be permitted, except on certain conditions, one of which was, that all children born of them should be brought up in the Catholic faith. The Diet, on the other hand, decided "that such marriages should not be hindered by anyone whomsoever; that the marriage blessing should be given in all cases by the minister of the religion professed by the bride; and that of the offspring of such union the male children should be brought up in the religion of the father and the female in that of the mother."

The Papal Nuncio, *Maria Durini*, having arrived while these events were in progress, sent to the royal chancellor an instrument containing the rights reserved to the Holy See, a copy of which he also sent to the Polish clergy. Stanislaus also received a message from Pope *Clement XIII.*, complaining of the illegal proceedings of the Diet, but King *Stanislaus* excused himself by saying that, inasmuch as the claims of the Dissidents were supported by the influence of a great power, he felt himself constrained to yield. "Every means," said he, "was tried to resist the demand of which you complain; but so threatening was the storm evoked by the indiscretion of certain nobles that we regarded it a special fortune to be able to gain the nearest port. Any further attempt to hold out against the tyranny of the North will henceforth be both useless and fatal." The clergy, more courageous than their sovereign, protested against the action of the Diet, particularly in regard to mixed provisions, declaring that, notwithstanding the signatures of many of the bishops affixed to its enactments, they would continue to regard such marriages as not binding, according to the laws of the Church, and that the bishops holding their seats in the Diet as *laymen* had no authority in the matter. In consequence the Consistory of Posen published a circular letter, denying the binding force of the enactments of the Diet; and the bishops, after having sent several communications on the subject to *Clement XIV.*, finally received a reply from Pope *Pius VI.*, in 1777, stating that they were to observe the instructions of Benedict XIV.

The *Dissenters*, in their efforts to carry out their extravagant notions of their own rights, had brought their country to the verge of ruin. All Poland saw with sorrow, when it was too late to correct the mistake, that the country was inevitably passing under the yoke of Russia, and the authors of her disasters were held up to everlasting execration. The *Confederation of Bar* was formed with a view to withdrawing Poland from the all-powerful influence of Russia, but no efforts could prevent the perpetration of that stupendous national wrong known as the *First Partition of Poland* in 1772. This event so exasperated the nation that, by the constitution of 1775, all Dissidents were declared incapable of holding offices of public trust and honour. To strengthen themselves, the Lutherans and Calvinists held a joint assembly at Lissa in the same year. Finally, the Polish nobles quar-

relled among themselves as to whether they should or not accept the new constitution of May 3, 1791, giving political rights to the cities, civil rights to the peasantry, and making the kingly authority hereditary; and, after once more bringing innumerable disasters upon their unhappy country, again afforded Russia and Prussia a pretext for the *Second Partition of Poland* in 1793.[1]

The gallant *Kosciusko*, at the head of a brave army, made a noble but fruitless resistance against the combined forces of Russia and Prussia.[2] He was overcome by numbers. A general uprising took place in 1794; the Prussians were forced to retreat to their own country, and the Russians were several times routed. But Austria, which had had no hand in the Second Partition, came forward now; the Russians and Prussians again rallied; Kosciusko, at the head of the last patriot army, was defeated; Praga was sacked; Warsaw captured; the Polish monarchy annihilated; and, by the *Third Partition*, in 1795, Poland was completely dismembered, and its name erased from the catalogue of nations. Her king, *Stanislaus Poniatowski*, submitted to be a pensioner on the bounty of Russia, and died broken-hearted at St. Petersburg in 1798. And thus perished the great Polish Empire, which at one time comprised twenty-seven millions of souls, and had so long formed the bulwark of Christendom against the assaults of the Turks and civilized Europe against the Mongolian hordes of Russia.

§ 373. *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus.*

**Riffel*, Suppression of the Society of Jesus, being an inquiry into the accusations, both old and new, against it, Mentz (1845), 1848. *Crétineau-Joly*, Vol. V. Against him, *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Lps., 1853, Pt. II. Against *Theiner*, *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, Pt. II., p. 1262 sq. *De Ravignan*, Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., Paris, 1854, and the Suppression of the Society of Jesus, Paris and Augsburg, 1854. The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions, by Rev. *Alfred Weld*, S.J., London, 1877. (Tr.)

In tracing the history of the Church in the various countries of Europe, we come upon facts that seem to prove that the Society of Jesus, which had been so active and useful in the preceding epoch, had lost somewhat of its primitive virtue and power, or had ceased to exert its energies within the scope originally designed by its founders. *Portugal* took the initial steps in the persecution of the Jesuits.[3] By a treaty, concluded in 1750, Portugal restored to Spain the rich colony of *San Sagramento* in exchange for seven Reductions of Paraguay, which had been so prosperous under the admirable government of the Jesuits. This treaty necessitated the removal of thirty thousand

[1] The opposition of the nobility was caused by the intrigues, influence, and money of Catharine of Russia. Only *five* out of two hundred thousand representatives of the Polish nation signed the document of *Targowitz*, sent to Russia as a protest against the constitution. (Tr.)

[2] It should be borne in mind that Prussia had encouraged Poland to proclaim the constitution of 1791, and that her king, Frederic William, had *sworn* to defend the Poles against Russia. But if she had not proved a traitor to her national honour, her history would have been wanting in consistency. (Tr.)

[3] *Murr*, Hist of the Jesuits in Portugal under Pombal, Nürnberg, 1787, 2 vols.

Indians from their happy homes. The Jesuits, acting in obedience to the king's orders, did their best to persuade these poor people to obey, but to no purpose.[1] From sheer desperation they rose in open revolt against the Portuguese. The Jesuits were accused of having incited them to rebellion, and of having established for their own aggrandizement a republic in the Province of Maranhão of a character *never before heard of*. This persecution was mainly, if not altogether, the work of *Pombal*, the Minister of *Joseph Emmanuel I.*, and of the canonist, *Pereira*. Whatever may have been the motives of the latter, the former certainly acted from a diabolical hatred of men who would not consent to be his tools, and from the lust of gold in which it was supposed the Reductions abounded. He also made a conspiracy against the life of the king, in which he endeavoured to implicate some of their number, a pretext for fierce denunciations against them. Ten of them were put on trial, and although, in spite of the notorious unfairness of the Court, nothing could be proved which in any way made them partners to the attempt upon the king's life, they were banished from Portugal and from the Portuguese dominions in both East and West, and after enduring atrocities, the very recital of which makes the blood boil, were set down on the docks of Civitâ Vecchia, in the Papal States, in the year 1759, when the Decree of Expulsion was published, and in the following years, to be cared for as best they might.[2] Their goods were confiscated, and those who had not been deported were left to languish in frightful dungeons until the death of the king, in 1777, when his daughter *Maria* gave them their freedom.

In France the Jansenists, the Encyclopædists, and the parliament all conspired together to compass the ruin of the Jesuits. The Society had not been able to establish itself in Paris until 1550, under Henry II., and even then against the will and in spite of the opposition of the parliament, the bishop,[3] and the university , and throughout the rest of France, only after the passage of the *edict of Soissons*, which subjected its members to numerous and vexatious restrictions. The extensive privileges conferred upon the Society by the Holy See roused popular prejudice against it, and in the then existing state of public opinion did it no little harm. The professors of the university viewed with extreme jealousy the establishment by the side of them of a society of educators, whose lectures were given gratuitously, and listened to with enthusiasm. The Huguenots were fairly astonished that men should be so bold as to found a Society for the avowed

[1] *Weld*, Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions, London, 1877. (Tr.)

[2] *The Month*, September, 1877, art. "Pombal and the Society of Jesus." (Tr.) Cfr. *Von Olfers*, On the Attempt to Murder the King of Portugal on September 3, 1758, being an Historical Inquiry, Berlin, 1839. Moreover, *Aquaviva*, the celebrated General of the Jesuits, by a decree of the year 1610, had emphatically condemned tyrannicide, and forbidden all Jesuits to even touch upon the subject in their lectures or writings.

[3] Not archbishop, for the See of Paris was raised to metropolitan rank only in 1622. See *Gams*, Series Eppor., p. 597. (Tr.)

purpose of entering into conflict with them, and on every available occasion exhibited towards its members their characteristic spirit of hatred and persecution. Finally, the *Jansenists*, conscious that the Jesuits were their most formidable antagonists on the doctrine *of grace*, combined their hostile efforts with those of the most relentless enemies of the society. Then it was that *Arnauld*, the father of the great Jansenist, and advocate of the Parliament of Paris, rose in his place and delivered a most intemperate speech against them, in which he charged them with being the enemies of the king and the partisans of Spain. The opposition to them grew still more bitter and violent when *Henry IV.* selected one of them for his confessor, notwithstanding that they had been at no pains to deserve this token of royal confidence.

When, in 1594, *John Châtel* made an attempt upon the life of the king, the guilt of the deed was imputed to the Jesuits, on the ground that Châtel, who had been one of their students, had declared he had heard Father *Guéret* teach that tyrannicide was permissible—a proposition condemned in the most precise and emphatic terms by both the society and the Holy See. Still, notwithstanding the frequent protestations of John Châtel, exonerating the Jesuits from any knowledge of his deed, the *whole* society was expelled from France by a decree of parliament, dated December 29, 1594. The parliaments of Bordeaux and Toulouse took the Jesuits under their protection, and at their request they were again recalled by Henry IV.

Henry IV. was murdered by *Ravaillac*, and again every effort was made, but in vain, to fasten the guilt of the miscreant deed upon the society. Its enemies were again baffled, but they did not despair of still accomplishing their purpose. Once more they cast about for a pretext, and it is a lamentable fact that this was furnished by the writings of some indiscreet members of the society. The errors contained in the works of *Harduin*, *Berruyer*, *Pichon*, *Escobar*, *Tamburini*, and others, though condemned by the Holy See, were laid hold on by *Pascal*, a zealous Jansenist, and one eminently qualified, by his splendid and versatile talents, to turn his advantage to the best account. In his memorable *Lettres provinciales*,[1] in which the extraordinary brilliancy of the style is equalled only by the audacious dishonesty of the writer, he quoted erroneous opinions, scandalous passages, and garbled extracts from the writings of several theologians and casuists of the society, and, after mutilating their sense, distorting their meaning, and wrenching them from their context, held them up to the world as fair specimens of the *moral teaching of the Jesuits as a body*. Thus, on the strength of only a few untenable and

[1] *Nicole* translated these letters into Latin. They were soon translated into every living language. 10th ed., Cologne, 1684. A public commission, composed of thirteen French bishops and doctors, pronounced them libellous, whereupon they were prohibited. Cf. *De Maistre*, De l'Eglise Gallicane, ch. 9. Nay, even *Voltaire*, Siècle de Louis XIV., T. III., ct. 37, declared "that the whole work was built upon such a foundation."

scandalous propositions, selected from the writings of a host of authors, and placed beside the maxim cruelly and falsely imputed to the society, *that the end justifies the means*, were the Jesuits held up to the world as teaching a code of morals which they detest; while no reference was made to their numerous ascetical works, which are models of their kind, and would have supplied the very best means of forming a correct judgment of their moral teaching. To their other enemies were soon added *Madame de Pompadour*, the mistress of *Louis XV.*, to whom they had refused to furnish a confessor, unless she would break off her relations with the king and her friend, the *Duke de Choiseul*, the patron of the Encyclopædists. These latter, led by *Voltaire* and *D'Alembert*, were specially interested in the overthrow of the Jesuits, who, on account of the ardent zeal they displayed in the cause of religion, the influence which in virtue of their office as teachers they exercised over the minds of youth, the consideration in which they were held by princes and sovereigns, and the loyal attachment they had always shown to the Holy See, were very naturally regarded as the most formidable and dangerous enemies to the revolutionary designs of this sect of philosophers. Hence Voltaire flung himself into the struggle against them with terrific earnestness, gathering up for this supreme effort all the energies of his soul, all the faculties of his mind, and all his power of derisive ridicule and scathing sarcasm. "Once we have destroyed the Jesuits," said he, writing to Helvetius, in 1761, in a tone of exultant anticipation, "and that *infamous thing* (the Christian religion) will be only child's play for us." By his advice, and with the encouragement of the Marquis de Pombal, Madame de Pompadour, and the Duke de Choiseul, D'Alembert published his notorious work, *On the Destruction of the Jesuits*, the appearance of which was a sort of signal for a general attack. To accomplish his purposes against the Jesuits, Pombal had for a long time been making a liberal use of money, and had even approached the Court of Rome with a venal proposition for the same object. Choiseul had followed his example, and an association of Jansenists collected a very considerable sum, called *the fund of safety*, which they used to hire unprincipled pamphleteers to calumniate the society. When preparations so extensive and thorough had been made, only a pretext, no matter how trivial, was wanted to begin the work of destroying the Jesuits. This was soon furnished. Father *La Valette*, the Procurator-General of the society in the island of Martinique, for the prosperity of which his commercial ability had done so much, had consigned to a house in Marseilles two valuable cargoes, worth several millions of francs, which were seized by English cruisers, and he was in consequence unable to meet his bills. An attempt was made to hold the society responsible for the loss, but it was answered that not only had La Valette engaged in commercial enterprises without the authorization, but against the positive prohibition of his superiors, who had on a previous occasion made good a loss of the same kind. A universal cry

was at once raised against them. The printing-presses were kept busy in running off pamphlets, in which the faults and the mistakes of individual members were coloured to suit the popular taste and published to the world. The subject was brought before the Parliament of Paris, where were many of the ancient and vigilant enemies of the Jesuits, who, at first feeling their way, cautiously abolished the privileges of the society, and ordered certain works by its members, which had been long forgotten, to be burned. But sadder still was the part taken by some of the members of the learned and respectable Benedictine Order of St. Maur, who seemed to have inherited a Jansenistic hatred of the Jesuits, in this memorable affair. They came to the aid of the parliament by publishing what they called *An Abstract of the Pernicious Assertions of the Jesuits*,[1] whilst the works written in defence of the society were consigned to the flames.

A strong effort was made by nearly all the bishops to save the Jesuits. They came together, and by an almost unanimous vote declared in favour of the society, and bore honourable witness to the character and conduct of its individual members, but all to no purpose. By a decree of parliament, dated August 16, 1762, the society was suppressed in France, because, as was alleged, it was dangerous to the State.[2] A pension or some honourable employment was offered to such of the members as would consent to affirm under oath that the spirit of the Institute was impious; but as very few were base enough to make so false a statement, nearly all were banished the country.

Two years later, Louis XV. confirmed by royal edict the decree of parliament, permitting, however, the members of the society to live in the country as private individuals, subject to the authority of the bishops. The bull *Apostolicum* of Clement XIII. (1765), confirming anew the society, had no effect other than to intensify the hatred against it.

In *Spain* a still more cruel fate awaited them. On the night of the 2nd and 3rd of April, 1767, all the Jesuits in the kingdom were placed under arrest, and conducted under guard to the sea-shore,

[1] Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses, que les Jésuites ont enseignées avec l'approbation des Supérieurs, vérifiés par les commissaires du Parlement, Par., 1762; compiled by Roussel de la Tour, Member of Parliament, Abbe *Gouzet*, Minard, and other Benedictines of St. Maur, especially *Clemencet*. Even *Grimm*, though a Protestant, and one of the suffragators of the Encyclopædists, refused to take upon him the responsibility of approving the work of the compilers against the Jesuits. Réponse au livre intitulé "Extraits des assertions dangereuses, etc.;" the place where the book was printed not given, 1763-1765, 3 T., 4to. Cf. *Riffel*, L. c., p. 155 sq. *Patiss*, Complaints against the Society of Jesus, Vienna, 1866. Dr. *Henn*, The Black Book, Paderborn, 1865 (against the frivolous accusation of *Tholuck!*). *Roh*, S. J., The Old Cry: "The End Justifies the Means," Freiburg, 1869. *Jocham*, Jesuit Morals, and the Moral Infection of the People, Mentz, 1869.

[2] *Henry Heine*, the determined enemy of the Jesuits, had the manliness to brand such excuses with the severity they deserve. "Poor Jesuits," said he, "you are the bugbear and the scapegoats of the liberal party. For myself, I could never consent to join the outcry of my associates, who, at the mere mention of the name of Loyola, become as furious as bulls before whose eyes a red rag is held." *Goethe's* saying is also àpropos: "One who is universally hated must have something good in him"

where they were embarked on board vessels bound for the Papal States. The edict of suppression of *Charles III.* was not made public until after this act of violence had taken place, and when at last it did appear it did not state that any preliminary investigation had been made, but simply said that the society had been suppressed for grave causes. In the kingdom of *Naples* the society was also suppressed, November 20, 1767, by royal edict of *Ferdinand V.*, the son of *Charles III.*, who, however, was completely under the influence of his minister, *Tanucci.* The society experienced the same cruel treatment from the brother of Charles III., *Ferdinand, Duke of Parma and Piacenza.*

Finally, the Court of Lisbon, together with all the Courts of the House of Bourbon, petitioned the Holy See to suppress the Society of Jesus. *Clement XIV.*, when making unusually large concessions to these Courts (*vide* p. 493), had requested time to examine into the charges against the Jesuits; but there was too much justice in such a request to be heard with favour by the princes of the House of Bourbon, who made the suppression of the society a condition to the re-establishment by them of friendly relations with the Holy See. Yielding to their pressing demands, Clement XIV., by the *brief Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*, dated July 21, 1773,[1] in virtue of the fulness of his apostolic authority, suppressed the society, because, as he said, in spite of many warnings, its members no longer kept in view the end, rendered the services, or procured the advantages which its founders contemplated in establishing it. The society, he went on to say, has, from the very date of its foundation, given occasion of serious complaint by interference in matters that did not concern it, by exciting jealousy and promoting discord, and by teaching novel and dangerous doctrines. He closed by saying that the measure was necessary as a means of restoring amicable relations between the Holy See and the Courts of the Bourbon princes, who had already suppressed the society, and banished its members from their dominions, that Christians living in the bosom of the Church might be kept from flying at each other's throats (nros. 22, 25). On a former occasion this Pope had said: "If you do not wish to see the Court of Rome fall from its present high estate, we must become reconciled with princes; for their arms reach beyond the boundaries of their own States, and the Alps and the Pyrenees are no barriers to their power." Clement XIV. would have shown himself at once more prudent and more just had he said to the Jesuits what Pius IX. did on a similar occasion in 1848. "In many countries," said he, "they are not willing to tolerate you or have you remain. Very good, then; withdraw from persecution for the present, and wait the return of better days." Had he done this, he would not have given a quasi-indorsement to charges that were *never proved.*

[1] *Reumont*, Ganganelli, etc., pp. 53-74; Germ. transl. of the Brief, pp. 380-403; and in *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Vol. II., pp. 356-376. It should be borne in mind that Theiner is a bitter enemy of the Jesuits. (Tr.)

Thus was the Society of Jesus sacrificed to the intrigues of its enemies. No attempt was made to establish the charges brought against it; no defence of it by its friends was listened to! And, stranger still! no one thought of impeaching before a regularly constituted tribunal a society whose members were accused of crimes the most odious, and such as had never before been laid to the charge of civilized men. It is evident, therefore, that force, and not justice, accomplished the suppression of the Society of Jesus. And, notwithstanding the wild outcry against the moral teaching of the society as a body, the individual members convicted of personal immorality were so extremely *few* as to prove that in practice at least their morals were very nearly perfect. Even *Voltaire*, their inveterate enemy, bore this testimony to them in a letter to D'Alembert. "While doing my very best," said he, "to realize the motto *Ecrasez l'infame*, I will not stoop to the meanness of defaming the Society of Jesus. The best years of my life have been spent in the schools of the Jesuits, and while there I have never listened to any teaching but what was good, or seen any conduct but what was exemplary."

It is possible this great society might never have been illegally and violently suppressed, if its superiors had consented at the right moment to make certain modifications in its organization; but *Ricci*, the aged General, believing in the indestructibility of the society, replied, *so it is said*, when approached upon the subject by his patron, Clement XIII., "*Let them be as they are, or let them cease to be*" (*Jesuitæ aut sint ut sunt aut plane non sint*).[1]

As soon as the bull of suppression had been promulgated, a sufficient military force to insure its execution was stationed in Rome, and *Lorenzo Ricci*, with some of his assistants, was kept in confinement in the castle of Sant' Angelo (1775). But to the last hour of his life, the old man, knowing well whereof he spoke, continued to bear witness to the injustice done the society, declaring that there was no adequate motive either for its suppression or for his own confinement. Nearly all the members of the society bore up under their hard lot with noble and dignified resignation.[2]

In those countries in which the Jesuits still lived in peace and wielded a powerful influence, which had been lately increased by the words of Clement XIII. in commendation of the society, the bull of suppression produced a profound sensation.

Frederic II., King *of Prussia*, believing with Lord *Bacon*[3] and *Leibnitz* that "if he would have really good schools, he must have

[1] The Founder of the Society, St. Ignatius, on the contrary, said: "The Society shall adapt itself to the times, and not the times to the Society." See *Genelli*, L. c., p. 328.

[2] Cf. *Riffel*, L.c., p. 193 sq. *Theiner* mentions a few whose patience was not proof against what they regarded as an injustice. Clement XIV., Vol. II., p. 491.

[3] Ad pædagogiam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu: consule scholas Jesuitarum! nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his melius. Quæ nobilissima pars pristinæ disciplinæ revocata est aliquatenus quasi postliminio in Jesuitarum collegiis, quorum quum intueor industriam sollertiamque tam in doctrina excolenda, quam in moribus informandis, illud occurrit Agesilai de Pharnabazo: *talis quum sis, utinam noster esses.* (De augment.

those of the Jesuits," said he would not permit the good Fathers of the society to close their schools in Silesia; for, since they came into that province, he had heard only words of unqualified praise of both their services and their conduct.[1] Out of regard, however, to the wishes of the Catholic authorities at Breslau, and of the Jesuits themselves, *who were unwilling to hold out against the papal bull*, Frederic *graciously consented* that their existence as a corporate body should cease, and that they should lay aside whatever was specifically characteristic of the society, but insisted that they should continue to direct the schools as secular priests. *Catharine II.* of Russia, who in the partition of Poland had obtained the northern portion of Lithuania, or *White Russia*, in which there were two colleges conducted by the Fathers of the society, the one at *Mohilev*, and the other at *Polotzk*, positively refused, in spite of the remonstrances of the Papal Legates, to allow the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* to be published in her dominions.[2] The Jesuits, after having obtained the permission of Pius VI., in 1778, were allowed by Catharine to establish a novitiate for the society. She also gave them the direction of the schools in the cities named, and ordered them to convoke a General Congregation at Polotzk for the purpose of electing a Vicar General for the Russian Empire (1782). Accordingly, *Stanislaus Czernievicz*, then acting vice-provincial, was chosen the head of the society, and ample powers were granted him to conduct its government, but on condition that a general should not be chosen in Rome. He was succeeded, September 27, 1785, by Father *Lenkievicz*, whose powers were similarly restricted. The Emperor *Paul* having also manifested friendly feelings towards them, permitting them to open a church, which he gave them, in St. Petersburg, Pius VII. so far modified the bull of Clement XIV. as to permit them to establish themselves in Russia as a congregation, over which he appointed *Francis Kareu* superior. It is difficult to understand how a society thus protected should have been expelled the empire shortly after its re-establishment in other countries by the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* of Pius VII., dated August 7, 1814.

§ 373*b*. *Worship and Discipline from the Sixteenth Century.*

Sacror. rituum congregationis decreta authentica, quæ ab an. 1558-1848 prodierunt, alphabetico ordine collecta. Leod., Brux., 1850. Manuale decretorum authenticorum sacræ congregat. rit., etc., ed. *Eberle*, Ratisb., 1851. The best edition of the *Decreta Authentica Congregationis sacrorum rituum* is the third Roman edition of 1856-1858, in 4 vols., 4to, by *Aloysius Gardellini*. (Tr.)

The Council of Trent published many decrees on *worship*, calling the serious attention of bishops and parish-priests to whatever was in

scientiar.) *Hugo Grotius* thinks the same: Magna est Jesuitarum in vulgus auctoritas propter vitæ sanctimoniam et quia non sumpta mercede juventus litteris scientiæque præceptis imbuitur. (Ann. de reb. Belg.) Cf., Vol. 3, p. 396, note 1.

[1] *A. Menzel*, New History of the Germans, Vol. XII., p. 58 sq., 2nd ed., Vol. VI.

[2] The documents on the subject may be had in the *Würzburg Friend of Religion*, April, 1847, and in *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, pp. 1321 sq.

any way connected with the divine offices. The Roman Catechism, published by the same authority, drew attention to the same subject, adding some instructive remarks and explanations. The Roman Missal, Breviary, and Ritual were to serve as a rule of worship in the various dioceses. At the request of the Emperor *Ferdinand I.* and *Albert*, Duke of Bavaria, Pius IV. granted, by way of trial, permission to some bishops to distribute Communion under *both* kinds (see Vol. 3, p. 429), but the practice, though favourably received at first, proved to have so many inconveniences that the bishops relinquished it of their own accord, and the Pope withdrew it. Many princes, and even bishops, unconsciously influenced by the practices of Protestants, petitioned the Holy See to simplify divine worship, to prohibit the too frequent exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, to restrict processions and pilgrimages, and to forbid blessings to be given, except in cases where there was a prescribed form either in the Roman Ritual or other approved work, representing that these precautions would remove many abuses. Pope *Clement VIII.* condemned the use of *unauthorized litanies in public worship*, declaring in his constitution *Sanctissimus* of the year 1601, "that as many persons, and even private individuals, under pretext of devotion, publish innumerable litanies, containing expressions either improper or scandalous, the Holy See, as in duty bound, prescribes that no forms are allowable other than those contained in the Roman Missals, Pontificals, Rituals, and Breviaries, and that of the Blessed Virgin, chanted in the chapel of Our Lady of Loreto; and that anyone wishing to publish or use any others in the public offices of the Church shall, under severe penalties, to be inflicted by their respective bishops and ordinaries, first submit them to the Congregation of Rites." By the same constitution, the following litanies were approved: 1. The litany of All Saints: 2. That of Loreto.[1]

Notwithstanding the regulations of the Council of Trent, and the clear, formal, and explicit instructions contained in the Constitution of Pius V., dated July 7, 1568, the French bishops, during the eighteenth century, still tainted with the poison of Jansenism, took upon them to authorize the publication of new missals, offices, and breviaries for the use of the clergy of their dioceses, thus contributing to destroy in the country of the Most Christian King the simple and majestic unity of Catholic prayer and worship. The first to mar the beauty and unity of Catholic liturgy in France were *Nicholas Letourneaux* and the Jansenist, *Claude de Vert*, a Benedictine, who were the joint authors of the Clugny Breviary, in which devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the authority of the Holy See are equally depreciated. The next to make innovations in the liturgy was *Foinard*, a Jansenist, the author of the well-known work, "A Plan for a *New* Breviary, in which the Divine Office is to consist chiefly of Extracts from Holy Writ." His idea was to take texts from

[1] As to the litany of the *Holy Name of Jesus*, the following statement is found in *Gardellini's* collection, n. 1553: Principes et Episcopi (Germaniæ) supplicarunt SS., ut *has litanias de nomine Iesu* auctoritate Apostolica non solum confirmare, sed per publicum edictum toti Christianitati hoc calamitosissimo tempore singulariter commendare dignaretur. Emi PP. S. R. Congr. præpositi, re mature considerata, censuerunt: "Litanias prædictas esse approbandas, si SS. placuerit." Die 14. Aprilis, 1646. No final action on the part of His Holiness is recorded. Moreover, as often as the statutes of newly-founded religious institutes were laid before the various S. Congregations of the Holy See, they uniformly declared that none other than the litany of the Saints and that of Loreto were approved for the *whole* Church. (Tr.)

their connection; to isolate them or combine them with others, as best suited his purpose, in such way as to destroy their true meaning, and make them fit in with and support his own erroneous views. This idea was carried out in the *Paris Breviary*, composed by *Duguet*, a Jansenist, and published by authority of Cardinal de Noailles. The bishops of Orleans, Nevers, Metz, Auxerre, Troyes, Montpellier, Lyons, and Toulouse, together with several religious Orders, also published breviaries on the model of that of Paris, *the city they now professed to regard as the centre of Gallican unity*, hardly ever mentioning the name of Rome, which was, they said, *only the centre of Catholic unity*. Thus were the foundations of the Church in France so loosened, and the whole fabric so unsteady, that it barely escaped falling from the centre of Catholic unity and becoming schismatical.[1]

Many new *feasts* were introduced from the sixteenth century onward, some in honour of the *Blessed Virgin*,[2] one of the *Rosary*, one of the *Holy Name of Jesus*, and one of the *Five Wounds of Christ*, commemorative of the *love* and *sufferings* of our dear Lord. About the middle of the eighteenth century the *Way of the Cross*, that admirable invention of Christian love, and the *Devotion of the Stations*, were introduced to take the place of pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and were intended to bring vividly before the imagination the places consecrated by the sufferings of Christ.

On the other hand, however, Benedict XIV., Clement XIV., and Pius VI., yielding to the representation of several princes, diminished the number of *public* holidays; at first enjoining but the hearing of Holy Mass, whilst allowing servile work; then suppressing some of the Blessed Virgin, those of the apostles, and others, and transferring their celebration to the Sundays following the days originally set apart for the feasts. The new feasts already mentioned were also either celebrated *in choir* or similarly transferred.

With a view to revive the primitive spirit, and in some measure to restore the primitive practices of *ecclesiastical discipline*, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV., *De Reformatione*, c. 8), had enacted that public penances should be done for *public* crimes; but so violent was the opposition to the decree that, in spite of the efforts of Benedict XIII. to have it enforced, it remained a dead letter. To compensate in some sort for this failure, the Council (Sess. XXV., *De Indulgentiis*) enacted that *indulgences* "useful and very salutary for Christians" should be sparingly granted; that every kind of traffic in dispensing them must be utterly abolished; and that the very name and office of alms-gatherers be done away with. (Sess. XXI., *De Reform.*, c. 9.)

From this time forth indulgences were principally attached only to *jubilees*, which, by decree of Paul II. (1470), were to be renewed every twenty-five years, then to certain *forms of prayer*, to particular *devotions*, and to other extraordinary events or unusual acts of worship. The *Inquisition*, consisting of six cardinals, was revived by *Paul III.* (1549) for the purpose of counteracting the influence and combating the errors of Protestantism at Rome and elsewhere. It

[1] See *Darras*, Gen. Hist. of the Church, Vol. IV., pp. 453-456. (Tr.)

[2] Festum nominis B. M. V.; festum septem dolorum B. M. V.; desponsatio B. M. V.; festum B. M. V. de monte Carmelo; festum dedicationis St. Mar. ad Nives; festum nominis Mariæ de Victoria; festum B. M. V. de Mercede (Our Lady of Mercy, for the deliverance of captive Christians); festum Patrocinii B. M. V.

survived longest in the smaller States of Italy. It was abolished in *Lombardy*, in 1775, by Maria Teresa; in *Sicily*, in 1782, by King Ferdinand; in *Tuscany*, in the same year, by Grand Duke Leopold; and finally in *Venice*, in 1797. In the last-named place it was wholly a *political* institution. It was likewise abolished in *Spain* in 1820, and in *Portugal* in 1826, under John VI. At the present day it exists only in Rome, as *modified* by *Pius V.* and *Sixtus V.*, and is known under the name of the *Sacrum Officium*, *Congregatio inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis*, and consists of twelve cardinals, with whom are associated as assistants a number of *consultors* and *qualifiers*. It is presided over by the Pope, and its office is to examine and pass judgment upon all words, writings, and deeds contrary to religion.[1]

§ 374. *Spread of Christianity.* (Cfr. § 349.)

See general sources of information; Lettres édifiantes, and † *Wittmann*, The Beauty of the Church manifested in her Missions, p. 840. *Henrion*, General History of the Missions, Vol. IV. *Hahn*, Hist. of the Missions, Vol. IV. *Marshall*, The Christian Missions, their Messengers, etc. *Grundemann*, Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867.

The Catholic Church in *China* was mainly sustained and consolidated by the exertions of the Seminary for Foreign Missions, founded in Paris in 1663. Unfortunately, the heated discussions that broke out among the missionaries regarding *Chinese customs*[2] did much to retard the progress of religion. The first dispute arose concerning an ancient custom the Chinese have of paying religious honours to Confucius and their departed ancestors, which those newly converted to Christianity obstinately refused to give up. Not wishing to shock their sense of filial piety, the Jesuits permitted them to continue the custom, while the Dominicans peremptorily forbade them to do so. Again, for want of a sign in the Chinese language adequately expressing the idea of *God*, the Jesuits had used indifferently the words *Tin-tshu* or Lord of Heaven, and *Tien* and *Shangti* or Supreme Emperor, and had allowed them to be employed by others, taking care, however, to prevent any false or idolatrous ideas or associations being connected with them in their Christian sense. *Father Ricci*, the founder of the Chinese missions, using the same precautions, permitted both forms of expression. In the preceding epoch both orders had pleaded their cases in Rome, and obtained conflicting decisions from Popes *Innocent X.* and *Alexander VII.*

On the revival of the controversy, *Clement XI.* sent *Tournon* as his legate to examine the questions involved on the spot amid their surroundings. His judgment was in accord with the decisions of the *Congregation* held *in Rome* in 1704, and he moreover forbade, in a document issued at Nanking, in 1707, the further use of the words *Tien* and *Shangti*, hitherto used to designate God. He was in consequence arrested by the enraged emperor, and cast into prison at

[1] *Bangen*, The Roman Court and its Actual Organization, Münster, 1854, pp. 92-124.
[2] See Vol. 3, p. 469.

Macao, where he languished until 1710, when he died. By the bull *Ex illa die*, of 1715, Clement XI. forbade, in still more precise and emphatic terms, the mingling of heathen customs with Christian rites, and the prohibition was renewed under still severer penalties by Benedict XIV. in his bull *Ex quo singulari* of 1742. The result of these measures was a general persecution, from which, however, a large number of Christians managed to escape.

The prosperity of the Christian communities in China received a severe shock in the suppression of the Society of Jesus and the destruction of the Seminary for Foreign Missions at Paris by the French Revolutionists.[1]

It was apparently impossible for Christianity to grow either in extent or influence in the *East Indies*, except by conforming, in some measure at least, to the national customs of the people. The occasion of the breaking out of the first persecution against the Christians at *Pondichery* was the production, in 1701, of one of those sacred dramas, so familiar to the Jesuits, in which St. George was represented as slaying the gods of India. Their condition became still more critical when Tournon, on his way to China, landed at Pondichery, and inhibited to the new converts what are known as the *ancient Malabar customs*, and when *Benedict XIV.* later on sustained his action. From that time forth it seemed that all hope of spreading the Gospel in India must be given up. To add to existing difficulties and complete the threatened disaster, the English and Dutch, whose power was constantly growing in these countries, refused to tolerate the presence of even Protestant missionaries.

In *Farther India*, comprising the former kingdom of *Assam*, the empire of *Burmah*, the kingdom of *Siam*, *Malay Peninsula*, and the empire of *Anam*, the last of which includes the provinces of *Tonquin*, *Cochin-China*, *Tsiampa*, *Camboja*, *Laos*, and *Laitho*, the Gospel was (after St. Xavier) first preached by the three Jesuit Fathers, *Blandinotti*, *Alexander de Rhodez* (1627), and *Anthony Marquez*. They were fortunate enough to convert three bonzes, who in turn became zealous missionaries. As time went on, a degree of ecclesiastical organization was introduced, and, in 1670, a synod was held at *Diughieu*. But here, too, the Church had to pass through the ordeal of persecution, which, breaking out in 1694, occasioned the demolition of Christian temples[2] and the exile or death of Christian pastors. In the years 1721 and 1734 many Jesuits were put to the sword for refusing to trample under foot the Sign of man's redemption. Towards the close of the present epoch

[1] Cfr. *Platel* (Norbert), Mémoires sur les affaires des Jésuites, etc., Lisb., 1766, 2 T., 4to. *Leibnitz*, too, defended the Jesuits in Novissima Sinica, 1697. For the controversial literature, see *Mamachi*, Orig. et antiq. chr., T. II., p. 407. *Pray*, Hist. of the Disputes on the Chinese Customs, Augsburg, 1791, 3 vols. Conf., likewise, the Periodical, *Voices* (Stimmen) *from Maria Laach*, year 1872, p. 278-287.

[2] Hist. de l'établissement du Christianisme dans les Indes orientales, Par., 1803, 2 T. Cf. The New Messenger of the World, by *J. Stoecklein*, Augsburg, 1726, Pt. XIX., Preface. *Urb. Oerri*, Etat présent de l'Eglise romaine dans toutes les parties du monde, Amst., 1716. *Rhodez, S. J.*, Missionary Travels in China, Tonquin, and Cochin-China, Freiburg, 1858.

the condition of the Christians was somewhat improved, and many of the natives, in dedicating themselves to the service of the altar, contributed to promote the spread of the Gospel.

After the revocation of the edict of persecution by the last emperor, Dsha-Loang, the Christians again enjoyed freedom of worship, and the condition of the Church was steadily improved. The Jesuits were also the first to preach the Gospel in *Cochin-China*,[1] where they were to be found as early as the year 1618, Father *Borri* being the best known of them. The fortunes of the Christians of Tonquin have been vary varied, and even in our own time persecution has hardly ceased in that country.

The first efforts of the Jesuits to preach the Gospel in *Tibet*[2] were seemingly unsuccessful. The *Capuchins* (from 1707), under their superior, Father *Horace della Penna*, were more fortunate, as many of the natives, convinced by their preaching, renounced Buddhism and embraced Christianity. Their success was somewhat facilitated by the fact that the hierarchy of Tibet, in its external aspects, presented a striking similarity to that of the Catholic Church.[3] The *Dalai Lāma* (i. e., principal or ocean) gave them leave to found a hospice at *Lassa*. The persecutions of 1737 and 1742, while they retarded the progress of the mission, did not cause the destruction of the houses of the missionaries.

In *South America* the Gospel was preached both by Franciscans and Jesuits, the missions of that country being among the most splendid triumphs of the latter. The Jesuits, Father *Sandoval* and Blessed *Peter Claver*, both laboured zealously and successfully in this mission. The latter, a native of Catalonia, from the moment of his arrival at Cartagena, in 1615, till his death, in 1654, performed marvels of Christian charity, converting multitudes of negroes, and literally carrying out in his daily life the promise he had made when taking his solemn vows, "to be the slave of the negro slaves." The labours of *St. Louis Bertrand*, of the Order of Friars Preachers in *New Granada*, were also attended with a large measure of success (1562-1569). On the western coast of South America the Jesuits established the *Llanos Missions*, chiefly under the direction of German Fathers, and the *Maynas Missions* along the banks of the Upper Amazon (since 1640). *Brazil* was first evangelized by Fathers *Anchieta* and *Nobreya*, also Jesuits, who were succeeded about the year 1655 by the celebrated preacher, *Anthony Vieira*.[4]

This distinguished Jesuit, who was styled the Cicero of Portugal, and who was in matter of fact the Las Casas of Brazil, introduced into that country, together with the teachings of the Gospel, a knowledge of the arts and sciences, of industry and commerce, and an

[1] *J. Koffler*, Historica Cochinchinæ descriptio, in epitomen redacta ab Anselm. Eckard, ed. *Chr. Murr*, Norimb., 1703.

[2] Relazione del principio e stato presente della missione del Tibet, Roma, 1722. *P. Giorgi*, Alphabetum Tibetan., Romæ, 1762.

[3] See Vol. I., p. 56 et sq.

[4] *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 509. (Tr.)

ardent love of freedom. Torn from his spiritual children, whom he so dearly loved, by the perfidy of his countrymen, and carried away by force to Lisbon, he again obtained leave to return in his old age, and pass the declining days of his life amid the scenes of the apostolic labours of his youth. He died at Bahia in 1697, then holding the office of *Superior-General* of the Missions of Maranham.

There is probably no country in the world whose missionary history is more worthy of study than the United States, and certainly none where the missionaries were more devoted or gave their lives more freely for the spiritual well-being of the natives. The faith came to the Indian simultaneously with the discovery of the land in which he dwelt, for in those days priests were the inseparable companions of every voyage of discovery, whether from the ports of the Old World or the stations established in the New. In a work like this it is not possible to do more than give the names of the heroes whose deeds it would be a pleasure to record, and the dates of events over which the Catholic writer loves to linger. The *first* missionaries to set foot on the territory now included within the limits of the United States were the Right Rev. *John Juarez*, *Bishop of Florida*, and his companions. They touched the shores of Florida in April, 1528. It is supposed the bishop and a companion perished either of hunger or from the hostility of the Indians in the same year. Father *Louis Cancer*, the heroic leader of a small band of Dominicans, who came to Florida in 1549, had barely touched land when he was struck dead with a club in the hands of an Indian. The Dominicans renewed their efforts in 1553 and 1559. St. Augustine, the oldest town, and containing the oldest church in the United States, was laid out by *Melandez*, a Spanish admiral, in 1565. But the missions of Florida were destroyed, the Indians dispersed, and the Franciscan monastery of St. Helena, in the town of St. Augustine, converted into a barrack after the cession of Florida to England by the treaty of Paris in 1763. So complete was the subversion of Christianity by the English in Florida that, on the breaking out of the War of Independence, not a single mission was to be found in the whole extent of that territory. *Mark of Nice*, a Franciscan missionary, penetrated to New Mexico in 1540. Father *Padilla* and Brother *John of the Cross*, both Franciscans, who first attempted to preach the Gospel within the territory of the present diocese of *Santa Fé*, each received a martyr's crown. Nearly forty years went by, and, in 1581, three more heroes of the same Order met a like fate, and in the following year *Santa Fé*, the second oldest city in the United States, was founded. But about twenty years later the missions under Father *Escobar* were very successful, whole tribes coming into the Church together, and Mr. *Shea* relates that "the Indians on the Rio Grande could read and write before the Puritans were established on the shores of New England."[1]

Texas was visited, in 1544, by Father *Andrew de Olmos*, a Spanish Franciscan, but no permanent mission was established until 1688, when fourteen priests and seven lay brothers of the same Order began their labours, and continued them with profit for above one hundred years.

In *California* the first Mass was celebrated by a Franciscan in 1601; but the true Apostle of the State was the Italian, Father *Juniper Serra*, also a Franciscan, who, with three other priests of the same Order, accompanied the expedition of *Galvez* in 1769. Their first mission was established at San Diego, whence he went north, founding, June 27, 1776, the present city of San Francisco († 1784). The seeds of Christianity were first sown in *Old California*, in 1697, by the Jesuits, *Salvatierra* and *Francis Kuehn*, the latter of whom had been a professor of mathematics at Ingolstadt. It required all their firmness and patient perseverance to root out the vice of polygamy, and here, as elsewhere, Christianity was the forerunner of civilization, the gracious influences of which followed close in its wake. On the suppression of the Jesuits, the Franciscans and Dominicans took up and carried forward the work they had here begun, thus permanently securing the blessings of religion to these benighted people.

In 1570 *Father Segura* and eight Jesuits perished in the present State of *Maryland* through the treachery of *Don Luis*, a young Indian, who had been taken to Spain by some of the early Spanish navigators, where he received a Christian education, but retained his savage and perfidious instincts. The State was formally occupied by the Catholic Pilgrim Fathers on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1634. Accompanying these pioneers of re-

[1] History of the Catholic Missions.

ligious freedom in the United States were Fathers *White* and *Altham*, both Jesuits, and the *first* English-speaking priests who laboured for the salvation of the Indian on this Continent. These good priests, assisted by others, who arrived from England and from the Seminary of Douai, extended the field of their labours, and so successful were they, that within five years after the first settlement was made they had *five* permanent stations, and five years later had converted the tribe of Pascatoways, with the Chief Charles, had brought whole villages under the yoke of Christ, and induced many of the Protestant colonists to return to the faith of their fathers. Such was the flourishing mission destroyed by Clayborne and his band of Puritan fanatics, who expelled the Catholic governor and carried off or sold the priests into slavery.

In the year 1609, eleven years before the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, a mission had been established in *Maine*, on Neutral Island, in Scoodic River, by the Jesuits, Fathers *Biard* and *Massé*, whence it was removed, in 1612, to Mount Desert Island, at the mouth of the Penobscot, in the present diocese of Portland. While the buildings were still in course of erection, the English, under the command of *Argall*, a furious bigot, attacked the place, killed *Brother du Thet*, carried off priests and colonists, and left the mission a heap of ruins.

About 1611, the French Jesuits had established a mission in *Canada*, which was soon in a flourishing condition, and, with the co-operation of missionaries from other Religious Orders, shortly placed upon a permanent footing, notwithstanding the inconveniences of a rigorous climate and the hostility of some of the natives. From this place *Father Druillettes*, a Jesuit, went to convert the Abnaki of Maine, and established the second mission in that territory on the upper Kennebec, in 1646. With the aid of the Franciscans and some secular priests, the Jesuits succeeded in converting the whole Abnaki tribe to Christianity. Again, the English from Massachusetts invaded these missions, dispersed the Indians, drove away or slew the priests, and destroyed the chapels. The noble Indians clung to their faith amid every sort of temptation and trial, and again rallied round the saintly *Sebastian Râle*, a Jesuit, when he came among them in 1695. This venerable priest and splendid Indian scholar, the greatest of the Abnaki missionaries, and one of the most illustrious Jesuits of North America, was most barbarously murdered by the English and Mohawks in 1724, who, having outraged and mangled his body in a manner that would disgrace a savage, proceeded to rifle the chapel and profane the Sacred Host. The English did fully as much as the Indian to prevent the spread of Christianity through the territory of North America.

Le Caron, a Franciscan missionary, had, in the words of Bancroft, "years before the Pilgrims anchored within Cape Cod, penetrated the lands of the *Mohawk*, had passed to the north into the hunting-grounds of the Wyandots, and on foot, or paddling his canoe, gone onward till he reached the shores of Lake Huron."

The first missionaries, however, in what is now the State of New York, were Fathers *Jogues*[1] and *Lalande*, who were sent from Quebec, in 1646, to found a mission among the Mohawks, by whom they were both murdered, October 18th of the same year, at the village of Caughnawaga, near the site of which stands the present city of Schenectady. Father Jogues had been taken prisoner and cruelly tortured by the same tribe in 1642, but, by the aid of the Dutch, made good his escape, only finally, like the Jesuit, *René Goupil*, who was tomahawked by them in the same year on the shores of Lake Champlain, to meet his death among them. The heroic and indefatigable *Brebeuf*, who so well appreciated the peculiar character of the Indian (*Huron*) mind, and had thoroughly mastered their language, was, together with his associate, *Lalemant*, captured by the *Iroquois*, and put to death with the most cruel torments (March 16, 1649).[2] Father Jogues was succeeded by Father *Le Moyne* in 1654, who, with Fathers *Chaumonot*, *Dablon*, and *Bressani*, all Jesuits, went among the Onondagas and Mohawks, and built St. Mary's chapel on the site where now stands the city of Syracuse; and in this humble chapel was the Holy Mass offered up, November 14, 1655, for the first time in the State of New York. Their success excited the jealousy of the medicine men, and to escape being massacred were obliged to fly to Canada not quite three years later, March 20, 1658. Father *Le Moyne* again visited the Five Nations of the Empire State in 1661, and after baptizing two hundred children, returned to Canada, where he died in 1666. By the year 1668 the cross rose above every village from the shores of the Hudson to the waters of Lake Erie. The village of Caughnawaga, on the Mohawk, where the first martyrs had offered their lives, became the

---

[1] *Felix Martin*, Life of Jogues, S. J., Paris, 1873.
[2] Amer. Cyclopæd., art. "Brebeuf."

centre of the missions of the Five Nations. To escape the evil influence and the persecution of their countrymen, the Indians of Caughnawaga, most of whom were Mohawks, removed to the St. Louis rapids, on the St. Lawrence, some miles above Montreal, where they founded a new village of the same name in 1676. The other missions of New York were, as usual, broken up by the English, after they came into possession of the territory by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713.

Jogues, whose name has been already mentioned, and *Raymbault*, were the first to preach Christianity in the Lake Country in 1641. They did not remain, but were followed, in 1660, by the venerable Father *Ménard*, also a Jesuit, who attempted to plant a mission three hundred miles west of Sault Ste. Marie. His fate is not known, but he is supposed to have perished either of hunger or by the tomahawk, and years after his cassock and breviary were found preserved as amulets among the Sioux. He was succeeded by Father *Allouez*, who, in 1665, established the mission of *Lapointe*, on the western extremity of Lake Superior. Many other missions were established, one of the most important being that at Green Bay by Father *André*, all of which were closed on the suppression of the Society of Jesus. Father *Potier*, the last who laboured in the country of the Great Lakes, died in 1781.

In the year 1673 the "Great River" was discovered by the celebrated Jesuit, Father *Marquette*, whose name will live both in the Lake Country and in the Valley of the Mississippi as long as this continent lasts. Starting at the Falls of St. Anthony, in the present State of Minnesota, he and other Jesuits explored the "Father of Waters" down as far as the mouth of the Arkansas, everywhere along their course announcing the glad tidings of the Gospel to the inhabitants; but to the humble Franciscan, Father *Hennepin*, is reserved the glory of having been the first person who explored the Mississippi from near its source to its mouth, and of having given the names of two of the greatest saints of his Order to the now celebrated *Falls of St. Anthony*, and to *Lake St. Clair*. Both *Marquette* and *Allouez* preached the Gospel to the Illinois, and Fathers *Poisson* and *Souel* suffered martyrdom at the hands of the tribe of the Natchez, in the Mississippi Valley.

Such are a few of the splendid triumphs of Catholic missionaries within the country now known as the United States, and such a few of the historical events of which every Catholic should be proud.

In the year 1675, through the influence of Louis XIV., a bishopric was established at *Quebec*, the most important place at that time in Canada, which, down to the year 1763, when the colony was ceded to England, continued to be filled by excellent bishops. This cession, however, did not interfere with the labours of missionaries, by whom many converts were made among the tribes of the Iroquois, Hurons, and Illinois.

In *Africa* the Capuchins, though, as has been already said,[1] working in the face of the most formidable difficulties, did not relax their noble efforts to gain souls to Christ. One of their number, *Zuchelli Congo*, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, converted the King of *Segno*. Missions were established at Cacongo and Loango in 1766 by some French priests, which they were forced after a time to relinquish, being unable to bear up under the pestilential heats of the climate.

[1] See Vol. 3, p. 472.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

Gieseler's Church History, Vol. IV., published by *Redepenning*, Bonn, 1857 (from 1748-1814). *Hagenbach*, History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 2nd ed., Lps., 1848 sq. (4th revised edit., Lps., 1871, 1872, or Vols. VI. and VII.; Engl. transl., by *Jno. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York, 1869.—Tr.) *Baur*, Ch. H. from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century, or Vol. IV., p. 572-679. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 519 sq.

§ 375. *On the Constitution of the Protestant Churches and their Relations to the State.*

Bibliography the same as at the head of § 336.

We have already seen (§§ 329 and 330) that the *episcopal* and *presbyterian* systems were alternately predominant in England until the accession of *William III. of Orange*, when the Episcopal was declared the Established Church for both England and Ireland. At the same time, freedom of worship was granted to all Dissenters, except *Socinians* and Catholics, who were not granted equal rights with other nonconformists until 1779. The Scotch expressed their determination to have the presbyterian form of church government in terms so decided and threatening that it was not thought safe to refuse it to them. The supreme ecclesiastical authority was vested in a General Assembly, which convened annually at Edinburgh, and was composed of representatives from the fifteen Provincial Synods.

In *Germany*, after the Peace of Westphalia, the efforts of the Protestants were directed towards securing the rights guaranteed them by that treaty. The duty of seeing to it that Protestants enjoyed these rights was vested in the deputies to the Permanent Diet of Ratisbon (*Corpus Evangelicorum*) (after 1663), which was a *political*, rather than a religious bond of union. As was quite natural, the Protestant Churches were but the subservient tools of the civil power, for in every State in which the Reformation obtained a foothold the tiara was added to the crown and the ring and crosier to the sceptre. In the national churches the spiritual was only a branch of the civil authority, and was exercised under its direction by consistories and ministers of public worship. At distant intervals the representatives of some provincial States convened in small synods, and while their suggestions might be condescendingly listened to, every demand in favour of the dignity or the freedom of the Church was repelled as an unwarrantable assumption of *clerical arrogance*. In the eyes of princes the Church was a respectable and, on the whole, not an inefficient police organization; and its estates and revenues were applied to objects wholly foreign to religion.

Should anyone be bold enough to advocate religious freedom

through the press, the representatives of that palladium of the rights of the people were at once given to understand that they must not invade those of princes. Even science contributed its part to the exaltation of the civil power over the Church. The theologians of Naumburg (see § 340,) declared that the transference of the spiritual to the civil authority was lawful, and sanctioned by Holy Writ; although it is but just to add that some of them objected, saying that Christ did not rescue His followers from the bondage of the Pope to have them become the lackeys of politicians.

In the early years of the Reformation the *episcopal* was the prevailing system of Church government, but it gradually lost favour until the opening of the eighteenth century, when the *territorial system*, as scientifically set forth by *Puffendorf* in his *De habitu religionis Christianæ ad vitam civilem*, published in 1687, and still further developed by *Thomasius* (fr. 1692) and *Boehmer* (fr. 1714), was substituted in its room.

Some time later a theological party sprung up, which, putting aside the special views of both Catholics and Protestants as to the origin of the Church, proved from the witness of monuments, reaching back more than ten centuries, that the Church had vested rights of her own. Starting with this proposition, *Pfaff*, Chancellor of Tübingen, drew out what he called the *Collegial System* (1719), according to which the Church is a corporate and independent body, possessing the inherent right of self-government, which may be transferred to the civil power by treaty, but which, when the conditions are changed out of which the compact grew, *again lapses to the Church.*[1] But the defect of this theory is the circumstance, overlooked by its author, that the transference by treaty of the rights of the Church, of which he speaks, in matter of fact never took place, this link in the argument being *assumed* to account for the existing condition of things. However, the theory had never any practical consequences, the princes continuing to exercise the functions of bishops over the churches in their several States. As to a Head, the Lutheran Church never had any, and what was intended to serve as such was never recognized.

§ 376. *Dogma and Theologians.*

Planck, Hist. of Protestant Doctrine since the Drawing up of the Formula of Concord; *Walch*, Religious Disputes, Vol. I.; *Dorner*, Hist. of Prctestant Theology: "*Rise of the Opposition to Antique Orthodoxy*," pp. 595-669.

After the death of Melanchthon, the two parties of the Philippists and Lutherans, into which the Reformation had split during the

[1] His work, De originib. juris ecclesiastici veraque ejusdem indole, Tueb., 1719; new edit., 1720, with a treatise, De successione Episcopali. Cfr. *Nettelbladt*, De trib. systemat. doctr. de jure sacr. dirigendor. (Observatt. jur. eccl., Halae, 1783). *Stahl*, Constitution of the Church according to the Doctrine and Law of the Protestants, Erlangen, 1840. *Puchta*, Introduction to Canonical Law, Lps., 1840. Cfr. moreover, *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 596 sq.

lifetime of its founders, were for some years alternately victorious, until, finally, through the Form of Concord, and the energy of its framers and promoters, orthodox *Lutheranism* gained a complete triumph in Germany. The University of *Helmstaedt*, however, through the influence of its founder, Julius, Duke of Brunswick, had never accepted the conditions of the Form of Concord, and was therefore free to cultivate and encourage more liberal tendencies. But the teaching of *Daniel Hoffmann*, one of its members, who, following the pattern left him by Luther, traduced philosophy as at once immoral and atheistic, was regarded as so shocking and blasphemous that it was declared an outrage on reason and an insult to the philosophical faculty, and he was in consequence deprived of his professorship by the prince in 1601.

To this seat of learning belonged also *George Calixtus* († 1656), who, by adopting the historical method, sought to give to theology greater breadth and freedom of treatment. But his views on grace and good works, his method of disassociating ethics from dogmatic teaching, his assertion that the mystery of the Trinity was not plainly revealed in the Old Testament, and especially his attempts to explain away the subtleties of the Form of Concord, brought him under the suspicion of his co-religionists, who charged him with wishing to introduce a corrupt *syncretism* (see Vol. 3, p. 410). They would have no authority, no rule of Faith but the Form of Concord, and accordingly the ablest of their theologians, among whom were *Calovius*, *Quenstedt*, *Koenig*, and *Baier*, set about refurbishing the weapons of Scholasticism to defend it. The Aristotelian philosophy was again restored, and the categories of *being* and *modality* again applied to the treatment of dogmatic theology. Considering the tenacity with which these theologians clung to what they supposed to be orthodox Lutheranism, it need not surprise us to find them given over to every sort of superstition, and, like Luther, possessed of a firm faith in witchcraft and sorcery, and believing with refreshing simplicity in the truth of his conflicts with the devil.

While *Frederic Spee* and other priests of the Catholic Church (see §§ 282, 353) were manfully and successfully opposing the absurd and barbarous practice of trying people for witchcraft, *Benedict Carpzov*, of Leipsig († 1666), who was styled the law-giver of Saxony, and whose opinion in matters of canon and criminal law was of great weight, maintained not only that sorcery itself should be severely punished, but also the denial of the reality of diabolical pacts;[1] and on this latter subject *John Henry Pott*, a celebrated professor at the University of Jena, published, in 1689, a treatise entitled *De nefando lamiarum cum diabolo coitu*. *Thomasius*[2] was the first to turn the tide

[1] On the Hist. of the Superstitious Practices of Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century (*Illgen's* Hist. and Theol. Review, 1841, p. 181); *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of Germany, Vol. VIII., p. 59 sq. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cylopæd., Vol. V., p. 160; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 301.

[2] *Luden*, Thomasius, His Life and His Writings, Berlin, 1803

of public opinion against these cruel and ridiculous trials. The last execution of witches took place in the Protestant cities of Quedlinburg in 1750 and Glarus in 1783.

Many orthodox Lutherans, adhering servilely to the letter of the law, regarded all personal effort *at sanctification* as useless and displeasing to God. One of the most remarkable men of this epoch, speaking of this blind and unreasonable faith, makes the following complaint: "In these latter days," he says, "there are four dumb idols set up for worship in the churches of the Christian world, viz., the baptistery, the pulpit, the confessional, and the altar; and people, conscious that they are baptized, that they hear the word of God, and go to confession and communion, content themselves with the external forms of Christianity, taking no thought of its inward power and virtue!"

As one extreme always produces its opposite, so this dreary and formal orthodoxy was opposed by the warm and more attractive Christianity of *Philip James Spener*.[1] Spener was born at Rappoldsweiler, in Upper Alsace, in the year 1635; was educated at Strasburg, where he first became pastor; thence he went to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he was appointed dean of the clergy (1666), then superior preacher to the Court of Dresden (1688); and, finally, driven thence on account of his energetic remonstrances with the elector on his personal vices, withdrew to Berlin, where he received the office of Provost of the Church of St. Nicholas (1691). To a highly cultivated intellect he united a sincere love of truth, and so nice an appreciation of true Christian feeling, that, in spite of the prejudices of youth and his attachment to the teachings and worship of his Church, he could not remain blind to the dangers that threatened the repulsive theological methods of the orthodox Lutherans, and their barren and dreary style of preaching. This conviction deepened when he began to study as his models the writings of the Dominican, *John Tauler*, whose heart was as warm as his intellect was brilliant, and to whom Spener was indebted for the devotional feeling and nervous energy which, in spite of their tedious prolixity, his sermons really possessed. Having in view a thorough reform of the existing ecclesiastical organization, he laid it down as a principle in nearly all his sermons *that religion is wholly an affair of the heart, and that a preacher, to properly exercise his ministry, must bring home to the minds and hearts of his hearers the convictions and feelings with which he himself is carried away*. Hence he held that no one can be a Christian theologian, in the true sense, who has not had personal experience of the influence wrought on the soul by the saving truths of religion. As if to give practical expression to his idea of a *model religious community*, Spener commenced, in the year 1670, to hold little reunions (*collegia pietatis*)

[1] *Hossbach*, Spener and His Age, Berlin, 1824 sq., 2 vols. *Knapp*, The Life and Character of Some Pius and Learned Men of the Last Century, Halle, 1829. *Franke*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Vol. II., p. 130-189, and 213-240. For further statements of bibliography, see *Dorner*, L. c., p. 624-648.

at his house, in which he strengthened the faith and warmed the piety of those present by devotional explanations of passages of Scripture and by holy converse.

These efforts, which were at first an expression of a real want of the age, in their further development assumed a peculiar and grotesque form. The new school soon began to give signs of the presence of a *spirit of sectarian pride*, and to develop habits of *gloomy melancholy*, so antagonistic to the serious yet cheerful serenity that always accompanies true piety.[1] After the first sympathetic feelings, inspired by the earnestness of the *Pietists*, as they were now called, on account of their ostentatious displays of piety, had passed away, they began to lose favour, chiefly on account of the rigorous code of morals advocated, and, as far as possible, enforced by Spener. Enemies rose up against him on all sides. The hostility of the worldly and corrupt was to be expected; but, besides these, he counted among his adversaries many theologians of learning and ability, who reproached him, not indeed with denying outright the Christian dogmas, but with depreciating their importance by teaching that they contributed little to the edification of souls.

Faithful to their traditions, they at once hastened to make civil princes the arbiters of their theological quarrels. The greatest excitement prevailed in Leipsig, where three professors, disciples of Spener's, one of whom was *Augustus Herman Franke*, opened, in 1689, a course of devotional lectures on the Holy Scriptures, which were partially scientific in character, but mainly practical, being for the most part an illustration of how Scripture lessons should be applied to the duties of everyday life. They were largely attended by students and the better classes of citizens, and were productive of much good. Two of their colleagues, *Carpzov* and *Loescher*, accused the lecturers of bringing public worship into contempt, of degrading science, of casting souls into a state of despondent melancholy, and of fostering spiritual pride and exclusiveness. Forced to leave Leipsig (1690), the three professors, in concert with Thomasius, founded the *University of Halle* in 1694. The neighbouring University of Wittenberg, taking alarm at this step, became from this time forth more intensely Lutheran than ever, and the two centres of learning came to be regarded as the representative schools of Protestant thought in Germany. Although very justly charged with holding extravagant theological views, and of having a haughty disdain for scientific acquirements, it cannot be denied that the Pietists exercised a beneficial influence upon public morals and upon the theological tendencies of the age. The effects of this influence were especially conspicuous in the writings of *Buddeus* († 1729), whose theological works are more simple, and withal more scientific in treatment, than are those of any of the

[1] *Pia desideria* (Pious Desires), or a Heartfelt desire after a Godly Improvement of the True Evangelical Church (First Preface to *Arndt's* Postilla evang., 1675), Frkft., 1678 sq.

contemporaries of the same school.[1] The same may be said of *John Albert Bengel*[2] (1752), whose explanations of Holy Scripture (*Gnomon Novi Testamenti*), while giving evidence of extensive learning, are pervaded by a spirit of warm devotional feeling. He was a hard and conscientious student of the original texts of Holy Writ, and was the *first to pave the way for the classification of the sacred manuscripts into families;* but the one aim of all his studies seemed to be to ascertain "the great day of the Lord," for, said he, "in the Scriptures the fulfilment of all time is the coming of Christ in glory" and "the breaking loose and binding of Satan." By calculations, based upon the Apocalypse, he computed that the world would endure for the space of 7777 years, and that "the breaking loose and the binding of Satan" would take place in the summer of 1836.[3] It is unnecessary to add that the event did not verify the prediction.

The speculative school of Bengel, represented by the Suabian prelate, *Oetinger*, and by *Fricker*, *Philip Matthew Hahn*, and *Michael Hahn*, subsequently coalesced with that of which *Jacob Boehm* was the recognised leader.

§ 377. *Abandonment of Symbols as Rules of Dogmatic Belief—Influence of Modern Philosophy, and its Consequences.*

Dorner, Hist. of Protestant Theology; Triumph of Subjectivism in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 673 et sq.

Not a few among the Protestants began to entertain serious doubts during the continuance of the conflicts just recounted as to the *binding force on the faithful of the dogmatic teaching set forth in the various books of symbols.* "It is indeed claimed," said the sceptics, "that dogmas have their sanction in Scripture; but, even so, are they not drawn out and expressed as conceived by the human intellect, which, inasmuch as it is limited by the extent of its historical and exegetical knowledge, is necessarily liable to be led into error? And if proof of this be demanded, we need only refer to the various changes made in the Augsburg Confession by Melanchthon himself, which were so numerous as to afford *Strobel* ample matter for a *literary history* of that document. Moreover, if the principle of free inquiry be once admitted, has not everyone a right, is he not in a measure bound to pursue the investigations already opened?" As Protestants had no satisfactory reply to give to this line of argument, their only logical course was to discard the

[1] *Buddeus*, Institutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ, Jenæ, 1723.

[2] *Bengel*, Novum Testamentum græce, in quo codd., verss. et editionn. describuntur, Tueb., 1734; his German translation of the N. T. claims to have rendered the original with the utmost fidelity (1753). *Gnomon N. T.*, in quo ex nativa verbor. vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinnitas, salubritas sensuum cœlestium indicatur, Tueb., 1759, 4to, ed. IV. *Steudel*, Tueb. (1835), 1852. Cf. *Dorner*, L. c., p. 648–662. *Kramer*, New Supplements towards the History of *A. H. Franke*, Halle, 1875.

[3] Ordo temporum a principio per periodos œconomiæ divinæ historicus atque propheticus. Tuebingen 1741. (Tr.)

symbols altogether, which many of them did. Their independent course made quite a stir, and subjected its participants to no little persecution. Driven, as Luther was, when his days were drawing to a close, to appeal to an infallible magisterial authority, the Consistories and the theologians, faithful themselves to the symbols, sought to force them upon all preachers and professors, and dismissed from their posts those who took leave to use in doctrinal inquiries the freedom of thought which was the vaunted birthright of all Reformers. This opposition, so contrary to the very genius of the Reformation, instead of checking the decline of Lutheran ecclesiasticism, which so many potent influences,[1] and notably *modern philosophy*,[2] were steadily undermining, only served to evoke more vehement and general *discussion on the books of symbols.*

Francis Bacon († 1626) had been directing men's minds to the study of physics and mathematics, and had raised the method of empiricism to the dignity of a law by making it a successful instrument of useful knowledge, but it must be said that in doing so he had no wish to divorce science from religion.[3] Whatever may be said of the defects of his moral character, and, if the truth is to be told, they were multitudinous and flagrant, he cannot be charged with a design of leading people into atheism. "*Leves gustus in philosophia*," said he, "*movent fortassis ad atheismum, sed pleniores haustus ad religionem reducunt.*"[4] Sir *Isaac Newton*, who lived some time later († 1727), regarded the sciences as themselves a sort of revelation.

The philosophy of *Descartes*, which was more favourably received by Catholics than Protestants, entirely revolutionized theological methods. Men delighted, after the fashion of the Breton philosopher, to call in question the truth of all acquired knowledge, to doubt the conclusions of theology and the teachings of tradition, and by the unaided efforts of reason, which was a criterion of certitude to itself, arrive at a knowledge of the existence and perfections of God.

The reaction against the Cartesian method was as violent as the applause with which it was received had been enthusiastic. The

[1] *Walch*, New Hist. of Religion, Pt. II., p. 305-382; among the *Reformed*, *ibid.*, Pt. III., p. 285-298; in England, Pt. IV., p. 491-566. † *Dannenmayr*, Historia succincta controversiarum de auctoritate librorum symbolicor. inter Lutheranos, Frib., 1780. Cf. The Symbolical Books of the Protestant Church in Opposition to Scripture and Reason, Lps., 1836.

[2] Cfr. Modern Philosophy (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII.)

[3] After declaring that he prays the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity in all humility to heap fresh blessings on the human family through his labours, Bacon goes on to say: "Atque illud insuper supplices rogamus *ne humana divinis officiant;* neve *ex reseratione viarum sensûs*, et accensione majore luminis naturalis, *aliquid incredulitatis* et noctis animis nostris erga divina mysteria oboriatur." Præf. Instaur. Magn., quoted by *Dr. Newman*, Idea of a University, London, 1873, p. 118. (Tr.)

[4] Novum Organon scientiarum, 1620, ed. *Brück*, Lps., 1830. Opera omnia, Lond., 1859 sq. Cf., also, Corpus philosophor., ed. *Gfrörer*, Stuttg., 1831, T.I., and *Ritter*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. VIII.; *Bonn Periodical* of Philosophy and Catholic Theology, new series, year IV., nro. 2, p. 188 sq. *Michelis*, Hist of Philosophy, p. 261, 262. *Kuno Fischer*, Bacon and his Followers, being a History of the Development of Empirical Philosophy, 2nd edit., Lps., 1875.

Synod of Dordrecht (1656) enacted that theology should be completely severed from philosophy, and passed a number of decrees condemnatory of Cartesianism, which had now become suspected of having liberal political tendencies.[1] *Spinoza*,[2] though professedly a Christian, and starting with Christian principles, contributed largely to weaken faith in Christianity and to make men's minds familiar with ideas leading directly to pantheism; while *Locke* († 1704), making the experiences of the senses the test of truth, opened the way to a superficial empiricism. *Leibnitz* († 1716), the true representative of the learning, both secular and ecclesiastic, of his age, as his days were drawing to a close, gave a sublime and almost Catholic exposition of the majestic truths of Christianity,[3] but to little purpose, as his influence on Protestant divines was well nigh inappreciable. Through the labours of *Wolf*[4] († 1754), his philosophy has been presented in a form intelligible to the ordinary mind. Wolf at first attempted to mathematically demonstrate the doctrines of the Church, but it soon became evident that he was endeavouring to put aside positive teaching altogether, and to substitute *natural religion* in its place; and he was all the more successful in this insidious design, in that the underlying principles of his new religion were derived from Christianity, though he was at great pains to conceal the real source from which they were taken.

This school produced a so-called *popular philosophy*, whose chief representatives were *Garve*, *Reimarus*, *Platner*, *Steinbart*, and *Mendelssohn*. In order, as they said, to have no guide but *sound reason*, they recast the philosophy of Wolf, stripping it entirely of its scholastic form. Henceforth the very idea of dogmatic Christianity was scouted, and even natural religion was a matter of grave doubt. Everything was based on *hypotheses*, so much so in fact that *Garve*, in a treatise on the existence of God, claimed for *theism* no more than the merit of being the best supported hypothesis advanced on the subject. These views were spread through the educational institutions of Germany by the writings of *John Bernard Basedow*, but chiefly by the pamphlet published by him at Leipsig in 1774, entitled *The Philanthropinon founded at Dessau*, giving a detailed account of the plan of this establishment, in which his idea of a model school was carried out. Something similar was attempted at Brunswick by his scholar *Campe*, and by *Salzmann* at Schnepfenthal, near Gotha.[5] All these writers, while pompously laying claim to the title of philosophers, were in fact only smart sophists; and when *Kant* appeared and gave

[1] Cf., above, p. 31, note 1; also *Hock*, L. c., p. 112 sq., and *Freiburg* Eccles. Cyclop., Vol. II., p. 374; Fr. tr., Vol. 6, p. 218.

[2] Opera omnia, ed. *Paulus*, Jenæ, 1802, 2 vols.; *Sigwart*, Spinozismus hist. et philos., Tueb., 1839. *Orelli*, The Life and Doctrine of Spinoza, Aarau, 1842.

[3] Works, ed. by *Klopp*. *Guhrauer*, Godfrey William, Baron von Leibnitz, being a biography, Breslau, 1842, II. Pts. *Ritter*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. VIII. *Staudenmaier*, Leibnitz on Divine Revelation (Tueb. Quart., 1836); *Münst*, The Speculative Theology of Leibnitz (ibid., 1849). *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 311-337.

[4] *Wolf*, Theol. natur., Lips., 1736, 2 T., 4to. *Ritter*, Hist. of Philos., Vol. VIII.

[5] *Charles von Raumer*, Hist. of Pedagogy, Pt. II., p. 242 sq.

to Protestantism, which had now neither a creed nor dogmatic teaching, the philosophy of *Kantism*, they were nearly stupified with amazement, and were no longer heard of. The influence of Wolf's philosophy on theology became apparent when the *Wertheim translation of the Bible*[1] was published. The work bears upon it the characteristic marks of this school, the aim of the editors being to depreciate biblical teaching and to cast suspicion upon the divine prophecies, a method of treatment which, it was said, the requirements of modern criticism demanded. The translation was suppressed within the States of the empire by imperial decree in 1737; but had it made its appearance fifty years later it would have been hailed with universal applause.

The Naturalism then in vogue among the English Freethinkers, and which was the legitimate product of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, was introduced into Germany, and propagated with a fierce energy little short of satanic. An association of the advocates of Conscience, calling themselves *Conscientiarians*, was formed, and its principles widely propagated by *Matthew Knutzen*, a sort of itinerant preacher from Holstein († 1764), who embodied them in popular tracts, which he circulated among the masses. He was followed in the same field by *Edelmann* († 1767),[2] who, from the year 1735 onward, wrote many violent works against Christianity, maintaining in rude but vigorous language, and with an air of imperturbable audacity, "that the Christian Korân, being quite as inconsistent with itself and as unauthentic as the Turkish, should be rejected; that, putting aside the fable of Christ, man, after the pattern of *Enoch* and *Noah*, should depend on reason alone, which is the *conscience* nature, like a provident mother, has set in the breast of all human beings to teach them to live uprightly, to harm no one, and to render unto everyone what is his due; that this is the *true Bible*, and anyone making light of it offers an insult to his own manhood; that there is neither God nor devil, neither heaven nor hell, except as they are created by the individual conscience; that the birth of Christ from a Virgin, his resurrection, &c., are fabulous tales; that marriage and fornication are equally estimable; and that priests, kings, and all magistrates whatever should be swept from the face of the earth." No one contributed more than *Frederic II.* to spread these teachings in Germany. He was the patron and constant correspondent of Voltaire, D'Argens, La Mettrie, and other French philosophers; received them at his court, and made the infidel works of their country fashionable among the upper classes of society. The *General German Library* (1764-1806), a literary review, edited by *Nicolaï*, also contributed powerfully to strengthen and encourage the spirit of irreligion that seemed to be leading the intellect of the

[1] Cf. *Walch*, Religious Disputes, Vol. V.

[2] Cf. Acta hist. eccl., Vol. IV., p. 436; Vol. VI., p. 292; Vol. XII., p. 119; Vol. XVIII., p. 957 sq. See also **W. Elster*, Remembrance of John Chr. Edelmann in reference to Dr. David Fred. Strauss, Clausthal, 1839.

world into bondage. For the first ten years of its existence it was the supreme literary tribunal of Germany, and as such its pages were open to laudatory notices of works hostile, not alone to faith, but to every noble sentiment and spiritual aspiration. The *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*,[1] composed by *Reimarus* († 1768), and collected and published by Lessing, were bitterly hostile to the whole teaching of Christianity, and exercised a potent influence in unsettling the convictions of many minds. In these the work of Christ is represented as an abortive attempt at revolt, his resurrection denied, and revelation declared impossible.

What Nicolaï and Lessing did for the upper classes was done for the lower by *Bahrdt*,[2] who, after having been successively a lecturer on theology at Leipsig, Erfurt, and Giessen, and the director of a benevolent society at Halle, finally closed his career of debauchery as an *innkeeper* in 1792. It would be difficult to find an author more wicked and trifling than Bahrdt; more intent upon destroying the authenticity of the Bible narrative by inventing absurd hypotheses to explain away its contents; and more eager to banish the teachings of the Church from the minds and hearts of the people, and to supply their place with an empty rationalism. But, though utterly despicable and worthless, he was either candid or shameless enough to avow that if the orthodox Protestants had paid him equally well he would have been equally zealous in the advocacy of their cause. The works of *Wünsch* and *Venturini* were of the same character, the former representing Christ as the victim of his own delusions, and the latter speaking of his life as a silly romance. *Mauvillon*,[3] though more learned, was not less wicked and energetic in his assaults upon the origin and ethics of Christianity.

§ 378. *Biblical Theologians—The False Enlightenment of Neologism—Classical Literature of Germany.*

Tholuck, Hist. Sketch of the Extreme Confusion of Theology in Germany since 1750 (*Miscellanea*, Vol. II., pp. 1-147). The Self-destruction of Protestantism, Schaffh., 1843. 2 vols. *Ficker*, A Critical History of Rationalism from the French of *Saintes*, Lps., 1845.

The bulk of the people had given up all faith in the Church as a teacher of divine truth. Neither did they any longer believe with the first Reformers that the Sacred Books were inspired and possessed

[1] 1. On the disparagement of human reason by the preachers; 2. On the impossibility of a divine revelation; 3. On the improbability of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea; 4. On the Old Testament—not written as a religious revelation; 5. On the falsity of the resurrection. (Historical and Literary Essays found among the Treasures of the Library of Wolfenbüttel; 3rd and 4th Essays, Wolfenbüttel, 1777; On the Aim of Jesus and His Disciples, Brunswick, 1778). Fragment by the Unknown of Wolfenbüttel, edited by Lessing, 4th ed., Berlin, 1835. Cf. Acta histor. ecclesiast. nostri temp., T. V., p. 711 et sq.; also *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., art. *Fragments*. *Fred. Strauss*, Reimarus and His Apology for the Rational Worshippers of God. Lps., 1862.

[2] Cf. Hist. of His Life by Himself, Berlin, 1794, 4 vols.; and *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop. Vol. I., p. 583 sq.; French trans., Vol. 2, p. 259 sq.

[3] The Only True System of the Christian Religion, Berlin, 1787.

characteristics *so essentially their own as to distinguish them* by unmistakable signs from all profane literature whatever.[1] Hence the more weighty theologians set about giving a more liberal, independent, and individual exposition of Christianity, thereby adjusting it to the new spirit now predominant in biblical studies. *Cocceius* († 1669) had early introduced this method by giving a purely biblical exposition of dogmatic teaching, in which he made no reference to the formularies of faith promulgated by ecclesiastical authority;[2] but the true founders of this school were *Hugo Grotius* and the Arminian, *Wetstein*, the latter of whom, having been banished from his native city of *Basle*, was then living in exile in the Netherlands († 1754). Its first advocate in Germany was *John David Michaëlis*,[3] from the year 1754 a professor at Göttingen († 1801). He was an ardent student of profane history, archæology, and the Oriental languages, though by no means so well informed as *Baumgarten* and *Ernesti*, who aimed at adjusting the study of theology with that of profane philology.[4] So far these men had made no direct and overt attack upon religion; they simply ignored the authority of all ecclesiastical teaching, professing to derive their doctrines from the Scriptures as the sole fountain of all truth. But, as always happens, the disciples went beyond the bounds set by their masters. Among the better known of the *rationalists* of the second generation were *Semler* (1725-1791), the pupil of Baumgarten; *Morus*, the pupil of Ernesti; and *Koppe* and *Eichhorn*, the pupils of Michaëlis and the compilers of the theological *neology*. The most dangerous of these was Semler,[5] who, like Michaëlis, had been educated in the pietistic school of Hall, where he received impressions that revived in his declining years. He was the intimate friend of Baumgarten's, by whose eloquence he was captivated, and who, recognizing his splendid talents, committed to him the office of reforming theology. "I am now too far advanced in years," said the master, "yours is the duty of taking upon you this task." Semler, while gifted with a tenacious memory, an acute mind, and a glowing imagination, was destitute of those philosophical

[1] *Wetstein*, Prolegomena in N. T. (1751): Nov. Testament., Amst., 1752, 2 T., f. He quotes in his explanations a good many sentiments of classic antiquity, as supposed parallel passages to those of the Bible. Accordingly, he puts in the same line the passage of St. Matthew, vi. 34: "Be not solicitous about to-morrow," &c., and the Epicurean saying of *Horace:* "Carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero," or "Lætus in præsens animus, quod ultra est, oderit curare, et amara lento temperet risu; nihil est ab omni parte beatum." (Odar. lib. I., 11, 8, and lib. II., 16, 25-28). But hereupon *Olearius* made the pointed remark: *Verbis* igitur, non *sensu* plerasque illas sententias cum salutari Salvatoris doctrina conspirare arbitramur.

[2] Summa doctrina de fœdere et Testamento Dei, Lug. Bat., 1648. *Alberti*, Cartesius et Coccejus descripti et refutati, ibid. 1678, 4to.

[3] His autobiography, with Remarks, by *Hassenkamp*, Rinteln and Lps., 1793. **Introd.* to the O. and N. T.; The *Mosaic Right*, &c.

[4] *J. v. Voorst*, Orat. de Ernest optimo post Grot. duce interpret. N. T., Lugd., Batav., 1804, 4to. *Ernesti*, Institutio interpretis N. T.; last edition by *Ammon*.

[5] Concerning *Semler*, *Eichhorn*, and the rest mentioned above, cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., under their respective names, and *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 701 sq.

habits of thought necessary to the work he was to undertake; and hence he made the mistake of putting the claims of the *Church*, which he regarded as partly immaterial to his purpose and partly a positive incumbrance to it, entirely out of sight. To him her brightest days were overcast with darkness. But, strange to say, he never seemed conscious of the character of the revolution he was effecting; and when, in 1779, it was completely triumphant, and he saw to what lengths it was carried by the impious and immoral Bahrdt, he was startled at his own work; and, taking alarm, sought in subsequent writings to correct his mistakes, maintaining that *religion* was of a twofold nature, viz., *public* and *private*; public, in that some sort of worship should be legally established and upheld in inviolable integrity; private, in that the individual should be free to hold or reject whatever he saw fit. Semler's revolution was the legitimate outcome of his *exegetical method* and the result of his singular criticism of the Old Testament. Starting with the correct rule that the Scriptures should be interpreted according to the language in which they were written, and with due allowances for the circumstances of place and time, he further held that they should be subject to the same rules of criticism and interpretation as any other book, and that no account should be taken of their divine character. Hence he maintained that some things in Holy Scripture being peculiar to the localities in which the objectionable passages containing them were written, should be accordingly restricted in their application, and that the myths, which he pretended to discover, should be rejected. This method rendered neccessary the rejection of many books enumerated in the Old Testament canon. Again, by grouping the leading and dominating facts of Christianity, so as to restrict them to certain specified periods of time, he stripped them of that character of universality which makes them applicable to all times and places; and by endeavouring to show that the New Testament was throughout only an effort at *adjusting* certain principles and views to Jewish notions and prejudices, he professed to believe that the teachings of Christ were truths of a general character only, and having no special and definite import of their own.

Finally, he maintained that the Bible contained nothing of value except its *moral teaching*, and that all else was useless in the Christian Church, thus narrowing down Christianity to a few ethical rules destitute of any authoritative sanction. In this way Semler, by a long and laborious historical process, arrived at the same conclusion that the popular philosophers had reached by a short cut, viz., that the Bible is only valuable as a moral guide.

The theologians of the various universities now gradually classified themselves into *three* parties; some contending for loyalty to the *orthodox teaching of the symbols*; others, while preserving the *form of biblical faith*, depreciating the necessity and importance of dogmatic teaching, and declaring that an ethical code was the one thing essential; and others, again, *openly assailing all revealed dogma*, thus fully developing the system of Semler.

By the side of the university theologians there arose a school of popular philosophers, including such names as *Mendelssohn*, *Engel*, *Nicolaï*, and *Sulzer*, who were acting in harmony with *Spalding*, *Jerusalem*, *Eberhardt*, and *Teller*, then the most distinguished theologians of Berlin, and with a society founded in that city by the Librarian, *Biester*, known as the "*Society for the Diffusion of Light and Truth*," and the aim of which was proclaimed to be the subversion of all usurped and tyrannical authority, the reformation of religion, and the substitution of a code of morals instead of dogmatic teaching, as the basis of religious worship. Such is the system elaborated by *Teller* in his German Dictionary of the New Testament, published in 1772; but, strange to say, he so far forgot himself as to assume the *perfectibility of Christianity*.[1] These excesses were in a measure restrained by the *edict of Woellner*, *the Prussian minister*, issued in the interest of orthodoxy in the year 1788.

Finally, the revival of *classical literature*, then ardently cultivated in Germany, particularly by the Protestants, when not positively hostile to Christianity, was not in sympathy with it. Among the leaders of this revival were some theologians of greatest name.

Lessing (1729-1781),[2] whom his father had destined for a student of divinity, disliking the study, devoted himself to letters, and was subsequently appointed Librarian of Wolfenbüttel. Without professing to be a theologian, he revived a partial taste for the study of divinity, which he pursued as an amateur, and published the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, "in order," as he said, "to humble those overbearing orthodox theologians, and to show them how untenable were their arguments." "But," he added, "while aiming a blow at the scientific pretensions of theologians, I do not wish to disturb the faith of Christians." Basing himself, like Semler, upon historical grounds, he maintained that just as there is a natural law so also is there a *natural religion*, and that as the former assumes a positive character when men begin to live together in society, so also does the latter, it being necessary to come to some understanding on details no less than on general principles. He also held that all religions, whether *positive* or revealed, were *equally true* and *equally false*, putting this sentiment into the mouth of his character of *Nathan the Wise*: "It is now as difficult to ascertain which ring is the true one as to

[1] Religion of the Perfect, Berlin, 1792.

[2] On the Origin of Revealed Religion; *Nathan*, A Parable, accompanied with an Humble Petition and a Letter of Final Retractation; A Necessary Answer to a very Unnecessary Question put by Head Pastor Goetze; Anti-Goetze, 1778. (The first complete edition of his works appeared in 30 vols.; Berlin, 1771-1794), and an excellent edition was edited by Lachmann (13 vols., Berlin, 1838-1840). See Vols. 10 and 11 of this ed. *Schwarz*, Lessing as a Theologian, Halle, 1854. *Boden*, Lessing and Goetze, Lps. and Heidelbg., 1863. *Staudenmaier*, Protestantism, etc., Vol. II., p. 227 sq. *Wolfgang Menzel*, German Poetry, Vol. III., p. 147 sq. G. E. Lessing's Life and Works, 1859, translated into English by *E. P. Evans*, 2 vols., Boston, 1866. *Nathan der Weise*, tr. by *Dr. Reich*, 1860, and *Ellen Frothingham*, 1867. An English translation of his "Education of the Human Race," London, 1858. (Tr.)

demonstrate now which is the true faith."[1] The profound aim of his work on the *Education of the Human Race*, addressed alike to scholars and to men of less cultivated intellects, is to withdraw mankind from a shallow and superficial naturalism. The scope of the heated discussion which he carried on with *Goetze*, the Lutheran Head-Pastor of Hamburg, was to show how the theologians, who had set aside *tradition*, had rashly and wantonly, from very fear of tradition, rejected truths without properly investigating them or trying them by the laws of true criticism. Lessing said he had rather have one Pope in Rome than countless petty Lutheran popes in Germany. Yet he was so many-sided in his opinions that his authority has been recently invoked by Twesten in favour of orthodoxy, and by Schwarz in support of rationalism.

Herder (1744-1803),[2] in his apologetical works, regarded Christianity more as *a creation of marvellous beauty* than as the one appointed means for the salvation of fallen man. Invited to Weimar, in 1775, by the Grand Duke, on the recommendation of Goethe, he was appointed court-preacher and consistorial councillor, and the growing reputation of his splendid talents soon brought him into contact with the most distinguished authors, and gave him a place in the foremost rank of German poets. But his morbid vanity was not proof against the insidious homage of flattery; his faith gradually gave way; and in the end his only ambition seemed to be to cover with contempt whatever his contemporaries held in honour. One by one the truths of Christianity were rejected; the teachings of the Gospel seemed veiled from his sight; his thoughts became obscure; and there was no longer any trace of positive doctrine to be found in his writings. Hence *John von Müller*, speaking of his otherwise esteemed work, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, says: "I find there everything except Christ; but what is the History of the world without Christ?" To Herder's mind Christ was only "the well-beloved of Jehovah." The want of consistency in his writings may be accounted for by the fact that his point of view was successively changed to suit the *chronological* sequence of the subjects under treatment as they came up one by one.

As these theologians, philosophers, philologists, and exegetical writers raised a multitude of questions in their works, without answering any, they left many minds dissatisfied, many hearts craving for comfort, and many souls weighed down with sorrow and yearning for better things. This explains the sympathetic approbation with which the simple and pious utterances of *Gellert* (1715-1769) were received; and the warm admiration that greeted the appearance

[1] This refers to a passage in Lessing's Drama, *Nathan the Wise*, Act III., Sc. VII. (Tr.)

[2] Christian Works, in five collections, Riga and Lps., 1794 sq. Religious and Theological Works, published by *G. Müller*, Tuebingen, 1805 sq., 10 vols. Cf. *Hagenbach*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 3rd ed., Pt. II., pp. 1-87; and *Gelzer* Modern German National Literature, Vol. I., p. 329.

(1748) of *Klopstock's Messias*, which, unlike Dante's immortal work, was not reared upon the everlasting foundation of the truths of Christian dogma, and could never have evoked such expressions of religious feeling as it did had there not existed deep down in the human heart an abiding belief in God and a hopeful trust in the Incarnation, which no amount of cold infidelity could entirely obscure or extinguish. *Hamann*, that prophetic thinker, who styled himself the *Magician of the North* (1730-1788),[1] and the popular writer, *Claudius* (1743-1815), were authors of more solidity than Klopstock and Gellert, and each achieved success in his own way and degree; the former among a limited and select class of readers, and the latter among a wider circle of followers, to whom he recommended the works of Fenelon.[2] Both witty and humorous, Claudius was unsparing in his ridicule of the false enlightenment of his assailants, representing them at one time as *Goliahs* and again as *Pigmies*. Philosophy could command his respect only in so far as it created in man a love for the true and the good: "for," said he, "if these be not esteemed in man, what is there else in him to esteem?"

Lavater (1741-1801), *Jung-Stilling* (1740-1817), and *Oberlin*, of Alsace, all of the Reformed Church, expressed a genuine admiration of the blessings of Christianity. *Wieland* (1733-1813), while under the influence of the writings of Klopstock, gave himself up to a sort of mystical piety, foreign to his nature, from which, however, he soon broke loose, and became atheistical in thought, and advocated, if he did not practice, a lax code of morals.

The writings of *Goethe* (1749-1832),[3] who laboured to cultivate among his contemporaries a taste for Pagan literature and a love of the classic creations of the Greek mind, contributed powerfully to extinguish the spirit of reviving faith. All the faculties of his splendid genius were concentrated on the one task of putting nature in the place of God. He detested both religion and politics, because, he said, their influence was fatal to art. Finally, *Schiller* (1759-1805), in his *Gods of Greece*, expressed his regret that, to give adequate glory to the One God of the Christians, the gods of Olympus should be sacrificed:—

> "And to enrich the worship of the *One*
> A Universe of Gods must pass away."

He then invoked the return of the happy age of Nature:—

> "Return, thou virgin-bloom on Nature's face."

---

[1] Biographical Memorial of John Hamann, Münster, 1855. *Herbst*, Library of Christian Thinkers, Lps., 1830, Vol. I. *Petri*, The Works and Correspondence of Hamann, until 1873, already three parts. *Gildemeister*, J. G. Hamann, the Magus of the North, his Life and Works, Gotha, 1875, 3 vols.

[2] Concerning *Claudius* and *Lavater*, see *Herbst*, L. c., Vol. II. Claudius' Organ was the *Wandsbecker Bote* (Wandsbeck Messenger). Cfr. supra, p. 33, note 4.

[3] *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. II., pp. 361-383. The better elements in Goethe and Schiller are pointed out by *Daumer*, My Conversion, Mentz, 1859, pp. 66 and 119 sq. Cf. *Hagenbach*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, Pt. II., pp. 113-138. We quote the first two of Schiller's passages from his Poems and Ballads, as transl. by Sir *Edw. Bulwer-Lytton*, Bart., New York, pp. 299 and 300. (Tr.)

He declared that he professed no religion *for religion's sake.* This is certainly a convenient way of working out one's salvation without "fear and trembling," and led the poet to indulge the hope expressed in his Hymn of Joy:

All sin shall be forgiven
And Hell shall cease to be.

§ 379. *The Herrnhutters.*

Zinzendorf, Actual Form of the Cross of Christ in Its Simplicity, Lps. (1745), 4to, Περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, or Natural Reflections (1746), 4to. Twenty-one Discourses on the Augsburg Confession, 1747-1748; The Brothers' Hymn Book. *Jeremias*, or Sermon on Sanctification, new ed., Berlin, 1830. Tracts, Frkft., 1740. *Spangenberg*, Life of Count Zinzendorf (Barby) 1772 sq., 8 vols. *Varnhagen von Ense*, Life of Count Zinzendorf (Biographical Monuments, Vol. V.) *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Hamburg, 1839, Vol. I. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Book II. *Herzog*, Cyclopædia, Vol. XVIII., pp. 508-592. *Plitt*, The Theology of Zinzendorf, Gotha, 1869, Vol. I.

The sect of the Herrnhutters or United Brethren were animated with the spirit of Spener and Franke, and were an outgrowth of the Moravian Brethren. They first consisted of a number of families, who, wishing to dwell in a Protestant country, quitted their old homes and settled on the estate of Count *Louis von Zinzendorf* (1700-1760), near Berthelsdorf. In the year 1722 they built themselves houses at the foot of the Hutberg, or the Watch Hill, near the count's residence, but subsequently the name was changed into *Herrnhut*, or the Watch of the Lord, whence they derive their appellation. The count, who, with his friends, *Frederic von Watteville* and *Spangenberg*, had been brought up in the Pietistic school of Halle, by the enforcement of a rigorous discipline, and what was styled "The *Cross and Blood Theology*," succeeded in introducing some sort of unity into the heterogeneous elements of which the new community was made up. He brought the members to accept a constitution containing what were called "*The Fundamental Articles*," and divided them into three principal classes or tropes, viz., the *Moravians*, the *Reformed*, and the *Lutheran*. These sectaries have always been distinguished by a spirit of pride, which has been the fruitful source of fresh divisions. The *bloody death of Christ upon the Cross* has been at all times their one cardinal point of doctrine, and the one unfailing subject of their sermons, hymns, and other writings, which are remarkable for quaintness of expression and a singularity of imagery more fanciful than just, the similes employed being very unusual, frequently extravagant, and at times even indecent.[1] While professing the most implacable hostility for Lutheran scholasticism, as fettering the free

[1] *J. Stinstra*, in his "Warning against Fanaticism" (transl. from the Dutch into German, Berlin, 1752), gives a compilation of them. Zinzendorf once led off the choir of his congregation in the following style:

"Du Raethsel der Vernunft
Du Thohu vehabohu (darkness, chaos)
Von der gesammten Zunft
Der Blutlichtscheuen Uhu;
Du Wunder aller Wunder
Mixtura inconfusa
Du bist's, der mir gefaellt,
Dein Gnadenstuhl frass Usa."

(2 Kings, vi. 3); *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, 2nd ed., Mentz, 1844, Vol. I., pp. 8-10.

and expansive spirit of devotion, they fell insensibly into a formalism still more slavish and barren.

The system of government among the Hernhutters was nearly the same as that of the United Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*) of the fifteenth century, whose name they also adopted. Their officers were of three classes, viz., deacons, elders, and bishops, though the last enjoyed no special prerogatives. They were divided into congregations, and each congregation again into *choirs*, according to age, sex, and kinship by marriage. Into the congregations no one was admitted except those designated as the *Awakened*, and accordingly the sluggish were brought to a sense of duty by discipline of various kinds; but if they still continued incorrigible, they were entirely cut off from membership. Each settlement was under the immediate government of a conference, consisting of its officers; and the whole community was governed by a permanent conference, composed of the elders, and the sessions of which were held at Berthelsdorf. Every four, ten, or twelve years, as convenience or exigency might require, the Conference of Elders called a *General Synod*, in which all matters of importance were transacted; but all questions that could not be satisfactorily disposed of by human judgment and foresight were decided by lot.

As years went on, a spirit of worldliness and commercial enterprise found its way among the Herrnhutters, and enfeebled, if it did not quite extinguish, their early religious fervour. One good, however, these communities accomplished; they afforded in an age of growing infidelity a peaceable asylum to such Protestants as still valued faith in the divinity of Christ as a precious pearl, and a treasure of inestimable price to fallen and redeemed man.

§ 380. *The Quakers.*

History of the Life, Travels, and Sufferings of George Fox, London, 1691. *Robert Barclay*, Theol. vere christ. Apolog., Amst., 1676, 4to, and often. *Penn*, Summary of the Hist., Doctr., and Discipl. of Friends, 1692, edit. 6th, London, 1707, with notes by *Seebohm*, Pyrmont (1792) 1798. (Tr. adds:) Rules of Discipline of the Soc. of Friends London, 1783, ed. 3, 1834. *G. Croesi*, Hist. Quakeriana, Amst. (1695) 1704. *Alberti* Account of the Rel. of the Q., Han., 1750. *Goughan*, Hist. of the People called Quakers, Dublin, 1789, 4 vols. *F. Clarkson*, Portraiture of Quakerism, London, 1806, 3 vols. *H. Tuke*, Principles of Religion, as held by Christians commonly called Quakers; in Germ. and Engl., Lond. and Lps., 1828. *J. J. Gurney*, Observations on the Society of Friends, London, 1824, ed. 7, 1834. *W. Sewell*, Hist. of the Quakers, London and New York, 1840, 2 vols. *W. R. Wagstaff*, Hist. of the Soc. of Friends, New York, 1836. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., ch. II.

George Fox, a cobbler, who was born in Drayton, a village of Leicestershire, in 1624, and died in 1690, is generally regarded as the real founder of the *Quakers*.[1] He professed to believe that all saving truth and religious consciousness are the immediate effect of the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who *in the day of His coming*

[1] For a good account of the lawless and indecent extravagances of this sect before it was joined by Penn and other men of culture, see *Blunt*, Dict of Heresies and Sects, art. "Quakers." (Tr.)

floods the soul of man with an *interior light*, which is the light of Christ. Neither exterior revelation nor Scripture itself can supply the place of this interior illumination; on the contrary, Scripture being an inferior revelation, requires this light to make clear its sense. It alone adequately confirms revelations, produces *true knowledge*, is the vivifying principle of religious life, and the nourisher of sincere piety. The teaching of the Quakers on *justification*, sanctification, the Sacramental system, and the perfect fulfilment of the Law is but a logical deduction from the fundamental principle. They hold that the sacraments are only external forms and ceremonies, and of themselves possess no efficacy. Every Christian is both a teacher and a preacher, and to preach and to teach are offices of no *special* character. Prayer is the spontaneous expression of the soul, and hence should not be fettered by any fixed and prescribed formulary.

They refuse, from conscientious motives, to render military service, to take oaths, to pay taxes, to indulge in games either of hazard or amusement, to permit music of any kind, to frequent theatres or plays, to read profane poetry treating of love and romance, and dancing of every sort is most rigorously prohibited among them. Such salutations as "Your Majesty," "Your Lordship," "Your Honour," and the like, they say, have a flavour of arrogance and a vain and worldly spirit, ill becoming a Christian; while greetings and subscriptions like "Your humble Servant" they characterize as hypocritical. To lift the hat, to remain uncovered, to address another in the plural number they hold to be sinful. They never try to right a wrong or seek redress before a secular court, nor do they lay a charge against anyone for any offence whatsoever.

William Penn (1644-1718), who had embraced Quakerism while a student at Christ Church, Oxford, after many trials, finally determined to provide a home in the New World for himself and his co-religionists, where they would be permitted to follow out their religious convictions unmolested. In the year 1681 he obtained from the crown, in lieu of a monetary claim, a portion of land on the *Delaware*, in what is now the State of Pennsylvania, and in the following year sailed from England, with several friends, and on the 30th of November of the same year had his famous interview with the Indians where now stands the town of Kensington. He planted a colony, more than half the inhabitants of which were Quakers, laid out the city of Philadelphia, and established toleration by law. This colony long continued to be an asylum for those who suffered persecution for their religious convictions in other parts of the country.

In England the Quakers were granted, in 1686, the same toleration enjoyed by other Dissenters. They are now everywhere rapidly decreasing in numbers. In Holland there are still a few congregations; in England they are daily losing ground; in Northern Germany they have nearly ceased to exist, there being but one congregation of them established at Friedrichsthal, near Pyrmont, in Hanover, in 1791. The Quakers have probably never exceeded two hundred thousand in number, and at the present time more than half of them reside in the United States, where, since the year 1827, they have been split into the two parties of the "*Orthodox*" and the "*Hicksites*." They organized a missionary Society in 1868, and have since established missions in India and Madagascar. Uniformly opposed to slavery, they have been the constant friends of both the freedman and the Indian. Of late years they have relaxed somewhat of their primitive severity, and are now more liberal in their views, particularly with regard to the arts of painting, sculpture, and music.

The name Quaker is etymologically derived from the verb to quake, and was first applied to them derisively, "because they often trembled under the awful sense of the infinite purity and majesty of God."

Other accounts are given of its historical origin, the most correct being, in all probability, that which refers the name to a circumstance in their early religious exercises; for, when the inspiration of the Spirit took place, the fact was revealed to those present by convulsions and shaking.[1]

[1] After having accepted the name given them by popular impulse, they set about proving its fitness to express sanctity. Thus Naylor, the forerunner of Fox, in a work pub-

§ 381. *The Methodists—Theological Literature in England.*

Hampson, Mem. of Wesley, and Hist. of Methodism, London, 1791, 3 vols.; ed. in Germ., Halle, 1793; Life of G. Whitefield, Edinburgh, 1826; edited after the English, by *Tholuck*, in Germ., Lps., 1834. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., ch. III., sections 75 and 76. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 513 sq. Transl. adds: The works of J. Wesley, Bristol, 1771 sq., 32 vols. *R. Southey*, Life of J. Wesley, and the Rise and Progress of Methodism, ed. 3, Lond., 1846, 2 vols. *H. More*, Life of J. Wesley, London, 1824 sq., 2 vols. *J. Gillies*, Memoirs of G. Whitefield, Hartford, 1835. *R. Philip*, Life and Times of G. Whitefield, London, 1837; New York, 1838. *J. G. Burckhard*, Complete Hist. of Methodism in England, Nürnberg, 1795, 2 vols. *J. Crowther*, Portraiture of Methodism, London, 1815. *J. W. Baum*, Methodism, Zürich, 1838. *T. Jackson*, Hist. of the Commencement, Progress, and Present State of Methodism, London, 1838. *Isaac Taylor*, Wesley and Methodism, London, 1851. *J. Whitehead*, Lives of John and Charles Wesley, London, 1793, 2 vols. Doc. and Hist. Invest. of Meth. in its Connectional Prin. and Pol,. 2nd ed., London, 1852. Minutes of Conferences in Engl. from 1744 to 1824, London, 1824, 5 vols. *S. Warren*, Chronicles and Digest of Laws, &c., of Meth., Lond., 1827, 2 vols. *Abel Stevens*, Hist of the Rel. Movement called Methodism, New York, 1861. *Geo. Smith*, Hist. of Meth., 1862, 3 vols. *L. Tyerman*, the Oxford Methodists, London, 1873. *W. P. Strickland*, Hist. of the Missions of the Meth. Ep. Church, Cincinnati, 1850. *R. Watson*, Theological Institutes, with an Analysis by *J. M'Clintock*. *Wm. F. Warren*, Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt, Bremen, 1865. For a complete bibliography of Methodism down to 1865, see the above work of Dr. Warren.

John Wesley, while a student of Christ Church, Oxford, formed a little association, composed of piously inclined students (1729), who, because of the gravity of their demeanour and the severe formality of their manners, were called by their fellow-students *Methodists* or the *Club of the Saints*. Such was the beginning of a great religious movement, whose influence has been most potent in England and the United States. Minds that had been unduly and fanatically excited by the events of the great political and religious revolutions through which England had passed, now that the incentives that had kept them at fervid heat were no longer in action, became as cold in devotion and as sceptical in belief as they had formerly been credulous and ardent. Infidelity was daily gaining ground, and moral depravity was steadily on the increase. The Anglican clergy, who should have been the teachers of truth and the custodians of morals, contemplated the advancing evils with indifference, or possibly thought themselves helpless to make head against so colossal a danger. The disease was rapidly eating into the vital parts of the nation, and it seemed that the whole body would become infected unless prompt and energetic treatment were applied. People were anxiously looking about them for men of strong faith and stout hearts to come forth and denounce sin and preach penance. It is not wonderful, then, that when *John Wesley* and his brother, *Charles*, and the eloquent and gentle *Whitefield* (from 1732) fulfilled in some sort these conditions in their ministry, they should be received with favour, and gain numerous

lished in 1653, proceeds to show how "that the earth quaked and trembled; that Isaac trembled exceedingly; that Moses feared and quaked; that the Lord bade His disciples quake for fear; and that therefore saints ought to be Quakers." *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects and Heresies, art. "Quakers." (Tr.)

proselytes to Methodism. The new sect, too, had a character peculiarly its own, distinguishing it from the various jarring and conflicting parties into which the Church of England was split, and this note of individuality was a potent element of its success.

Wesley, through intercourse with the Herrnhutters, some of whom were his companions on a voyage he made to America, in 1735, was very favourably impressed with their teachings and practices, and, with a view to obtain a more accurate knowledge of their organization, visited their communities in Germany and Holland in 1738, in company with *Spangenberg*. This is also about the date when he began to hold *the doctrine that the presence of divine grace in the soul and the consciousness of the remission of sin are indicated by strong religious feelings, manifesting themselves externally in convulsive movements of the body*. While attending a meeting of one of the Moravian societies, May 24, 1738, in Aldersgate-street, London, he experienced such an entire change during the reading of Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, that he ever after regarded this as the moment of his conversion, which, he tells us, with a commendable desire to be accurate in affairs of such import, took place at precisely fifteen minutes before nine o'clock. "I felt," he said, "my heart strangely warmed; that I trusted in Christ and Christ alone for salvation; that He had taken away my sins; and that I was *saved* from the law of sin and death." It is characteristic of this state, he assures us, that whoever has personal experience of it is forthwith lifted into a purer and more serene spiritual atmosphere, out of reach of the disorderly movements of the flesh and beyond the unruly annoyances of sense, and is so constituted as to enjoy complete *exemption from sin*.

Although retaining the form, organization, liturgy, and symbol of the Anglican Church, the community founded by Wesley was distinguished from it by an austere *asceticism*, which displayed itself in numerous and rigorous fasts, in special prayers at stated hours, in the assiduous reading of the Bible, and in a frequent approach to the communion table. Such was the zeal and enthusiasm of *Whitefield* and other apostles of Methodism that its teachings spread rapidly, both in England and North America.

The Methodists had no desire to separate from the Established Church, and did not formally do so until forced to take the step by the jealousy and uneasiness of the orthodox ministers. Wesley having himself never been consecrated, in 1784 assumed the office of a bishop, and began to ordain ministers and make bishops for the special and exclusive service of the Methodist community. From this time forth the Methodists saw themselves engaged in a conflict with the Established Church on the one hand, and with the Herrnhutters on the other. Apart from the keen personal rivalry of Zinzendorf and Wesley, during the lifetime of the former, there was a wide divergence of opinion between the two sects they represented on the doctrines of grace and regeneration. Even Wesley and Whitefield could not agree on the questions of grace and predestination, and separated as early as

1740; the former adopting the views of *Calvin;* the latter those of *Arminius*, though the following of Wesley was much the more numerous of the two. Wesley was not a little startled to learn that, in spite of his honest efforts to improve the lives of his adherents, *antinomian principles* had found favour among them, and were developing a frightful state of immorality, and he concluded that the teachings of Calvin held too prominent a place in his system.

Fletcher,[1] a disciple of Wesley's, endeavoured to draw out still more distinctly and precisely the points of difference between the Wesleyans and the followers of Whitefield, and at a conference held in 1771, and presided over by Wesley in person, the questions in dispute were discussed and defined.

The elements of the organization of the Methodist community are: 1. *Bands*, composed of from five to ten persons each, who, under the direction of a leader, meet *voluntarily* once a week to examine the state of their consciences, confess their sins publicly, and thus keep alive an abiding sense of guilt. 2. *Classes*, composed of from ten to thirty persons, who are *required* to meet once a week and tell their individual "experience" during the preceding week. A number of these classes make up a "*society*" or congregation, and to one of them every Methodist must necessarily belong. 3. *Circuits*, consisting of a number of "societies" or congregations, having some considerable town or city as a centre, and including the outlying country to a radius of some ten or twelve miles. Each of these circuits has from one to five ministers, technically called "travelling preachers," because they are not allowed to continue more than three years in the same circuit, and under these are the "local" or lay preachers, who reside permanently in the circuit to which they are attached. The senior minister exercises a general supervision over all the affairs of the circuit, and is called a "superintendent." 4. *Districts*, including some eighteen "circuits," and organized for the purpose of having the preachers meet at stated times to confer upon matters of finance and discipline, and to transact the ordinary business of Conference when that body is not in session. 5. *Conference*, consisting of the "travelling preachers," and being the supreme governing body of the Methodist community. It meets once a year and fills its own vacancies. Its sessions may not be protracted beyond three weeks, nor last less than five days.

The Methodists aim at reviving spiritual life among the masses through the ministry of their itinerant preachers, and at founding benevolent associations on a large scale. All the divisions of Methodism in Europe, America, and Australia numbered, in 1874, 3,626,830 full members and several hundred thousand probationists.[2]

§ 382. *The Swedenborgians, or Church of the New Jerusalem.*

Swedenborg, Arcana cœlestia in verbo domini detecta una cum mirabilib. quæ visa sunt in mundo spirituum, 1749 sq., 8 T., 4to, ed. *Tafel*, Tueb., 1833 sq., 5 vols.; Vera chr. rel., Amst., 1771, "True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church, by Emmanuel Swedenborg, Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ," transl. from the orig. Lat. Work, 5th ed., Lond., 1819. A series of writings by and respecting Swedenborg, communicated by *Immanuel Tafel* and *Louis Hofacker;* especially, Divine Revelations, from the Latin, Tueb., 1823 sq., 8 vols.; The Doctrine of Christ in its Purity, Tueb., 1831 sq., 4 vols.; Catechism and Doctrine of the New Church, Tueb., 1830. (After the Catechism of the General Conference, London, 1828.) *Tafel*, A Comparative Exposition and Review of the Doctrinal System of Cath. and Prot.; also, Exposition of the Differential Doctrines of Swedenborg, Tueb., 1835. *Tafel*, Swedenborg and his Adversaries, Tueb., 1841, 2 vols. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., chap. IV. *Jos. Goerres*,

---

[1] See *Fletcher's* Checks to Antinomism, Vol. II., pp. 22, 200, 215. Works, Vol. III., p. 50; Vol. IV., p. 97. Compare Dr. *Milner's* End of Rel. Controv., Letter VI.

[2] *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, Heresies, etc., art. "Methodists." Amer. Cyclop., art. "Methodism." (Tr.)

Em. Swedenborg and his Relation to the Church, Spire, 1828. *C. F. Nanz*, Em. Swed., the Northern Seer, Hall in Suabia, 2nd ed., 1850. Many works of Swed. have been translated by different persons, and published by *O. Clapp*, of Boston, 1848-1851. *J. G. Wilkinson*, Biogr. of Em. Sw., Boston, 1849. *A. Clissold*, Practical Nature of the Doctrines of E. S., Boston, 1839. *K. Hagenbach*, Ch. H. in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries; tr. by Hurst, Lecture XXI., p. 473 sq. *Dorner*, L. c., pp. 662-667.

Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772) was the son of Jesper Swedberg, the Lutheran titular Bishop of Skara, in West Gothland. He was highly educated, held the office of Assessor of the Royal Metallic College at Stockholm, travelled much through Europe for scientific purposes, and when about fifty-five years of age began to fancy himself the recipient of supernatural revelations. He professed to have been lifted up to heaven, and there to have received a commission to restore true Christianity and to inaugurate a new and endless era for the Church. This era was to open precisely on the 19th of June, 1770. This was to be the New Heaven and the New Earth, the *Celestial Jerusalem* foretold in the Apocalypse. Notwithstanding the theosophic and speculative character of the doctrine of Swedenborg it had also an eminently practical bearing.

After attacking the doctrine of justification, as held by Protestants, with a view of showing that it is dangerously subversive of morality, he went on to draw out a strangely *grotesque system* of his own, substituting for the mystery of the Trinity and the dogma of redemption through Christ's death a triple manifestation of the Godhead, first in the person of our Lord, and again in Swedenborg himself. This he did because a belief in the Trinity and Christ's vicarious death was the groundwork of the Protestant view of justification by faith alone, which he regarded as detrimental to purity of morals. As a consequence, he was obliged to reject the doctrines of original sin and man's fall. All these teachings, he said, were errors introduced into Christianity by the Council of Nice, previously to which his was the prevailing idea of the Trinity. Angels and demons, according to him, are only other names for the souls of the just and the reprobate; and the doctrines of satisfaction through Christ, predestination, and the resurrection of the flesh are only idle inventions. Having elaborated his system, he set about arranging the canon of the Sacred Books so as to fit into it, and neither retained nor quoted as revealed and authentic, any portion of either the Old Testament or the New, except the Four Gospels and the Apocalypse, on which he put his own novel and arbitrary interpretation.[1]

The followers of Swedenborg, who were chiefly of the better classes, were quite numerous in Sweden, England, North America, France, and Würtemberg. In the last-named country his fantastic writings, published by *Tafel*, were extensively circulated. In an age characterized by every sort of intellectual and religious lawlessness;

[1] *Tafel*, The Divinity of Holy Writ, or the Deeper Sense of Scripture, Tuebingen, 1838.

when society was rent asunder by schism and made dreary by unbelief; when the first stirrings of reviving faith were beginning to be felt and the religious sense to be purified by the very excesses of Protestantism; and when the intellect was not yet sufficiently emancipated from its old habits to seize what was simple and logical and appreciate what was pure, and on this very account liable to be fascinated and led captive by what was new and strange, the incoherent reveries of Swedenborg found acceptance, because they answered a state of mind not fully prepared for the majesty of truth yet repelled by the deformity of error.

§ 383. *Protestant Missions.*

Steger, Protestant Missions and their Happy Results, in three parts, 2nd ed., Hof., 1844. *Wiggers*, Hist. of Evangelical Missions, Hamburg, 1845. *Herzog's* Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., p. 559 sq. *Grundemann's* Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867-1871.

At no time in the history of Protestantism have its ministers displayed the same heroic spirit of self-sacrifice which has in every age been characteristic of the priests of the Catholic Church; and in no instance have the missions undertaken by the former, notwithstanding the immense wealth at their command, and the other conditions of success by which they were surrounded, ever attained anything approaching the measure of success reached by those of the latter. Why, it may be asked, did not the Protestants, in the fervour of their first enthusiasm, imitate the example of the Jesuits, whose origin was almost contemporaneous with theirs, and carry the light of faith and the consolations of grace to those sitting in darkness in far distant lands? It may be urged that their ardent and expansive charity had a work sufficient for its resources in reclaiming the Catholic idolators at home. Doubtless it had. But it is certainly not very complimentary to the astuteness popularly ascribed to the Jesuit that he did not allege a similar pretext, and thus escape the difficulties and perils of a foreign mission. Of all the Protestant sects, the *United Brethren* were the most distinguished for missionary zeal (since 1732); but so grotesque and fantastic was the Gospel which they preached that, while it found favour with a comparatively small number of persons already familiar with and prepared to accept its peculiarities, it was utterly powerless to effect the conversion of the rude and untutored savage. Desirous of retaining peaceable possession of her *North American colonies*, England made an effort to convert their aboriginal tribes to Christianity, and for this purpose sent out *John Eliot*,[1] who commenced his labours among them in 1646.

In 1647, the Puritans, who were then in possession of the supreme authority, established a society for carrying the light of the Gospel into foreign lands; while the pious *Herrnhutters*[2] and the ardent

[1] *Eliot*, Chr. Commonwealth, or the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ, 1652 sq., 2 T., 4to. *Mather*, Eccl. Hist. of New England, London, 1702, f.

[2] An Abstract of the History of the Missions of the Evangelical Brethren, Gnadau, 1833. Cf. *Walch*, New Religious History, Vol. VIII., p. 251 sq.

Methodists, acting on the impulse of faith and devotion, and without either official recognition or aid from Government, crossed the seas to aid in winning the savages to Christianity.

Following the example of England, the Danish Government established, and, with the active assistance of the Orphan House at Halle, has maintained since 1706 a mission at *Tranquebar* for its East India possessions, from which the first Protestant missionaries were obtained by England for her East India and West India colonies. In the East their success was inconsiderable, and in the West the conversions were wholly confined to the slave class.[1]

Denmark and Sweden sent missionaries to the frozen regions of *Lapland* and *Greenland*,[2] where the seeds of Christianity, sown at an earlier date by Catholic evangelists, had almost perished from the soil. Since the fifteenth century the name of Greenland had almost dropped out of the list of European countries, to whose fellowship it was now destined to be restored by *Hans Egede*,[3] a pious and zealous Norwegian minister, who, aided by the Danish Government and by a society of merchants (1721), made his way to the frozen shores of its western coast, where he found a few thousand Esquimaux, to whose conversion and improvement he devoted his energies, and among whom the blessings of Christianity and civilization have been perpetuated by the establishment of Danish colonies. The *Moravian Brethren* have (fr. 1733) established several missionary stations in Greenland.[4] Mention should also be made here of the *Institution* founded at Halle, in 1728, by Professor *Callenberg* for the conversion of Jews and Mohammedans, but the results in no way answered the expectations of its founder.

§ 384. *Relations of Catholics to Protestants.*

The relations subsisting between Catholics and Protestants in the different countries of Europe were of course as various as the circumstances that called them forth; but, strange to say, notwithstanding

[1] Missionary Reports, publ. at Halle, since 1708. *Walch*, L. cit., Vol. V., p. 119. Memoirs of *Chr. F. Swartz*, and Hist. of Rel. in India, London, 1826.

[2] Acta hist. eccl., T. XI., p. 1 sq.; T. XV., p. 230 sq. *J. Shefferus*, Hist. of Lapland, with Sketches, etc. Oxford, 1674, f. *Leem*, Laplanders in Finmark; tr. from the Danish into Germ., Lps., 1771. *Rudelbach*, in Knapp's Christoterpe, 1833. (Tr.)

[3] *H. Egede*, Account of the Greenland Mission, Hamburg, 1740. (*Hans Egede*, A Description of Greenland and Life of the Author, London, 1818.) *Paul Egede*, Accounts of Greenland, summarized from a Diary, from 1721-1740, Copenhagen, 1790. *Rudelbach*, Hans Egede, Bp. of Greenland (Chr. Biogr., 1850, Vol. I.); Iceland, Greenland, and the Faroe Isles, New York, 1830. *Kölbing*, Hist. of the Mission of Greenland, Gnadau, 1731. Missionary Records respecting Greenland, Labrador, etc. (Pres. Board), Philadelphia, 1830.

[4] The *Danish* Lutherans have (from North to South) organized the following *twelve* missionary districts, viz.: Upernavik, Omenak, Ritenbenk, Jacobshavn, Christianshaab, Egedesminde, Holsteinborg, Sukkertoppen, Godthaab, Fiskernaes, Frederikshaab, Julianeshaab. The *Moravian Brethren* have erected the missionary districts of New Herrnhut (1733), Lichtenfels (1758), Lichtenau (1774), Friedrichsthal (1824), Umanak, and Igdlorpait, in Greenland; and (fr. 1771) those of Nain, Ohkak, Hopedale, Hebron, and Zoar, on the coast of Labrador. *Grundemann*, L. c., p. 62 sq. (Tr.)

the desolating horrors of the Thirty Years' War, they were more pacific in Germany than elsewhere. It is not meant, however, that the bitterness of polemical strife had entirely ceased to manifest itself in the attitude of parties towards each other, but only that matters were mending. So deep-seated and persistent was the hostility of Protestants towards the Catholic Church and everything that came from her, that even so late as the middle of the eighteenth century they declined to accept the corrected Gregorian Calendar; and when, in 1744, *Prince Hohenlohe* showed a disposition to force his Lutheran ministers to celebrate the feast of Easter on the same day with the Catholics, the *Corpus Evangelicorum*, smarting under other real or imaginary grievances, declared they would have recourse to arms, rather than do so, and in 1750 made good their word. Moreover, so intolerant and fiercely violent was the expression of feeling against Catholics on the occasion of the celebration of the *Second Centenary Jubilee of the Reformation*, and so extravagantly fulsome the chorus of praises extolling the merits and virtues of Luther,[1] that the celebrated controversialist, *Weislinger*, indignant at the insults put upon his faith, and smarting under the wounds inflicted by the poisoned shafts of his adversaries, adopted a similar method of warfare, and with such effect that he was pursued through every court, ecclesiastical and civil, to which he was amenable, by his Protestant aggressors.[2] Again, when, in 1731, *Count Leopold Anthony von Firmian*, Archbishop *of Salzburg*, having ordered such of his Protestant subjects as were resisting his authority and inciting his Catholic subjects to rebellion and apostasy to quit his dominions, about twenty thousand of them departed without molestation, some to take up their abodes in the depopulated districts of Lithuania, and others to go either to England or America,[3] both his moral and religious character were assailed with brutal violence, and his decree of emigration characterized as an act of barbarous intolerance, such as had never before disgraced a civilized ruler. But though the character and the acts of the archbishop do not merit the

[1] *Weislinger*, in the preface to his work entitled *Friss Vogel oder Stirb*, says: "If all that they (the Lutherans) incessantly reproach us with in their writings, sermons, conversations, and jubilee medals were true, then there never existed on this earth, or could exist, a religion more diabolical than the Catholic faith and worship, or a people more godless and more deserving the execration of mankind than the Catholics themselves."

[2] See p. 48, note 4.

[3] *De Caspari*, Authentic Hist. of the Emigration from Salzburg, transl. fr. the Latin into Germ. by *Huber*, Salzburg, 1790. *Zauner* and *Gaertner*, Chronicle of Salzburg, Vol. X., Salzb., 1821, pp. 20-399. History of the Emigrants or Lutherans banished from the Archbishopric of Salzburg, 3rd ed., Lps., 1733, 4to. This work is written in partisan spirit, and is flagrantly untruthful. †* *Clarus*, Emigration of the Protestant Proselytizing Salzburgians in the years 1731 and 1732, Innsbruck, 1864. Cf. *Hist.* and *Political Papers*, Vol. 54, year 1864, pp. 813-842. *Gfroerer*, in the first volume of the Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, draws attention to the partisan spirit of the History of the Emigrants, &c., noted above. "In my opinion," he says, "the Salzburg Emigration is the darkest page in the history of Frederic William I. And yet, if we read the works published in Northern Germany, we shall be told that Archbishop Firmian is a monster of iniquity, while Frederic William I. of Prussia is extolled as a paragon of purity, an upright prince, and a model man. To what a depth of degradation is our national historical literature fallen!"

severity of the censure they have received, it cannot and need not be denied that the conduct of his officials in carrying out his instructions is not defensible, and fully deserves the stern rebuke administered in the review of these transactions by *Clarus*.

The members of the Reformed Church within the *Palatinate of the Rhine* also made frequent complaints of acts of oppression, which they claimed they had suffered at the hands of the Catholic House of *Neuburg* of the Palatinate.[1] But whether their hardships were real or imaginary, they were mild in comparison of those suffered either by the *Huguenots* after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes[2] or by the Dissidents of Poland, in consequence of the interference of foreign powers in the internal affairs of that country.[3] While the Catholics of the British Empire were under the restriction of laws of the most despotic severity, *Joseph II.* of Austria issued an *Edict of Toleration* (1781), granting freedom of worship to all Protestants, *Deists* alone excepted. After the conquest of Silesia by *Frederic II.*, both Catholics and Protestants were placed on a footing of perfect equality (1742), though the former were decidedly in the worse condition, by reason of the confiscation of the estates belonging to their convents.

As mixed *marriages between Catholics and Protestants* were becoming daily more frequent, in consequence of the increasing intercourse between the members of both denominations, they gave rise to serious difficulties as years went on. Protestants, now in the enjoyment of the fullest political franchise, laid claims also to privileges which the Catholic Church reserves for her own children; and when marrying Catholics demanded the blessing of the priest, while professing to believe that marriage was not a sacrament. Although the question was *then* an open one among theologians, the doctrine held at Rome was *that the contracting parties are the real ministers of the sacrament of marriage*, and not the priest who gives the marriage blessing,[4] still *Benedict XIV.*, following the imprescriptible principles of the Church, when questioned upon the subject by bishops, and notably by those of Holland and Poland, returned the uniform answer contained in the bull *Magnæ nobis admirationis* (issued June 29, 1748), namely, that mixed marriages could be *tolerated* only on certain conditions, the most important of which is that the children born of them be brought up in the Catholic Church; but that they should never receive such colour of approval as a formal ecclesiastical

[1] *Planck*, New Hist. of Religion, Pt. II., pp. 125-226, with Proofs and Illustrations.
[2] See Vol. 3, p. 380.
[3] *Huth*, Vol. II., pp. 233-241. *Walch*, Pt. VII., pp. 7-160.
[4] The Interpretes Conc. Trid. declared on the 31st of July, 1752: "Accedit, parochum in matrimoniis nullam exercere jurisdictionem, cum ex *veriori* et *receptiori* sententia ipse non sit minister magni hujus sacramenti matrimonii, qui cum aliis testibus certam reddat ecclesiam, hunc atque illam matrimonium contraxisse, ut ex hac quoque ratione abesse videatur quæstio de jurisdictione a delegato non subdelegando." (Thesaurus resolution, sacr. Congr. Conc. Trid., T. XX., Rom., 1752, pp. 91, 92.)

function would imply.[1] Far, however, from wishing these conditions to serve as a sort of clandestine apparatus for proselytism, popes bishops, and zealous ecclesiastics have at all times dissuaded against such marriages as detrimental alike to the happiness of the family and the interests of religion.[2]

§ 385. *The Russian Church under the Permanent Synod* (Cf. § 359).

Pichler, Hist. of the Schism between the East and the West, Vol. II., p. 144 sq., with reference to the new works of *Theiner*, *Gagarin*, *Haxthausen*, and others. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Russian Church, Frkft., 1872, 2 vols.

It has been already stated[3] that even from a political point of view the growing power of the Patriarch of Moscow had roused the jealousy of *Peter the Great*, who was apprehensive that possibly this ecclesiastical dignitary might some day resist the arbitrary demands of a despotic Tzar. He formed the design, therefore, of abolishing the patriarchate, and substituting in its stead an ecclesiastical organization, from whose opposition the Government would have nothing to fear in carrying out its projects. The undertaking was surrounded with no ordinary dangers, as the people were much attached to the patriarchal constitution, and hence it was necessary for the Tzar to proceed with great prudence and caution.

On the death of the *eleventh* Patriarch, in 1702, Peter employed all manner of pretexts to put off the appointment of his successor, and, as a temporary provision, placed the administration of the patriarchate in the hands of the metropolitan of Riazan, who, being but a mere exarch, neither commanded the respect nor possessed the fulness of authority belonging to the lawful incumbent of the patriarchal office. During this interval the interference of the Tzar in ecclesiastical affairs was in the highest degree arbitrary. He levied taxes upon the estates of convents and bishops; abolished the titles and dignities attached to bishoprics, whose incumbents had given him offence;

[1] *Luther* and *Calvin* held a very different opinion on this subject, declaring that marriages between Catholics and Protestants were utterly inadmissible and impious, and appealing for authority to the words of St. Paul, "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers." (2 Cor., vi. 14.) Enactments were passed by the synods of *Lyons* (1568) and *Saumur* (1596), embodying the same sentiment; while that of *Montpellier* (1598) pronounced sentence of deposition and deprivation against all ministers who should bless mixed marriages. The ground of such severity is thus stated by *Gentilis*, and is characteristically Calvinistic. "Catholics," he says, "may well permit such marriages, because, from their point of view, Protestants are only *heretics;* but Protestants must emphatically reject them, because in their eyes Catholics are not only heretics, but *antichrists!*" This opinion was modified some time later by *Carpzov*, who allowed "that mixed marriages might be permitted, but only on condition that there be a reasonably certain hope of both the Catholic party and all the offspring being eventually Lutheran."

[2] †*Binterim*, Memorabilia, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 137 sq.; Pt. II., pp. 1-179. †*Kutschker*, Mixed Marriages, Viewed from the Catholic Standpoint, 3rd ed., Vienna, 1841. †**Kuntsmann*, Hist. of Mixed Marriages among the divers Christian Denominations, Ratisbon, 1839. †*Roskovany*, Historia matrimoniorum mixtorum. Quinque Ecclesiis, 1842, 2 T. †*Reinerding*, The Principle of Canon Law in the Question of Mixed Marriages, Paderborn, 1854.

[3] See Vol. 3, p 514.

and, when these sees fell vacant, directed the exarch to fill them with simple bishops, whose pastoral prerogatives he attenuated to the verge of extinction. He soon began to introduce radical reforms in the convents of men and women, as is shown by the series of ordinances on this subject drawn up in 1702 and succeeding years. The Tzar next gave his attention to the secular clergy, and was good enough to write out with his own hand a pastoral instruction, in twenty-six articles, called a *spiritual regulation*, prescribing the qualifications of candidates going up for orders, and of bishops for consecration, and treating other cognate subjects, and this, in his character of Supreme Bishop, he addressed to the bishops of his obedience for their guidance and edification.

The Russian Church was then organized as follows:—

Every cathedral or episcopal church was to have one protopope, or, as we should say, dean, two treasurers, five popes (i.e., fathers), one protodeacon, four deacons, two readers, two sacristans, and thirty-two choristers to sing the service. In the principal parish churches there were to be one protopope, two popes, two deacons, two chanters, and two sacristans; in other more considerable parish churches, two popes, two deacons, two chanters, and two sacristans; and in parishes of two or three hundred families, three priests, three deacons, and three sacristans were charged with the care of public worship. If there were too many clergy at one church, part of them were sent where their services were more needed.

By these measures the Tzar accustomed both clergy and people to yield a passive obedience to the behests of his powerful will, and thus advancing step by step ended by abolishing the office of Patriarch. In a solemn assembly of bishops he finally declared that, in his opinion, the patriarchate was no longer necessary, either for the government of the Church or the well-being of the State; that, since the extent of the empire rendered supreme spiritual authority perilous when committed to a single individual, and inefficient when, vested in a general council, he had determined to introduce a form of ecclesiastical government that would combine the elements of both, without the dangers or inconveniences of either; and that this should consist in a small, *select*, and *permanent* synod, with full authority to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs.

When some of the bishops, by way of remonstrance, ventured to state that the patriarchate of Kiev and that of all the Russias had been established only by the authority of the Patriarch of the East, the Tzar, assuming an *authoritative* air, and striking his breast, replied, "*Behold here your Patriarch!*" As the event proved, the Tzar knew his men, for it was not long until there were to be found among them ecclesiastics and bishops cowardly and base enough to take upon them to justify the imperial measure, and to sacrifice to a wicked ambition the independence and freedom of the Church they professed to serve. At the head of this troop of ecclesiastical poltroons was *Theophanes Procopovicz*, since 1718 Bishop of Pskov and Narva. After these preparatory measures, Peter submitted at the last Council of Moscow, in 1720, his "*Ecclesiastical Regulation*," as

corrected by his own hand, for the approbation and signature of the bishops, archimandrites, and hegumenes of the principal monasteries. This council also enacted that the "Holy Synod" should be *permanent* and enjoy supreme ecclesiastical authority, and that its decisions should be final in all matters appertaining to the Church. The "*Regulation*" also set forth the motives which impelled the Tzar to establish a *Holy Synod*, whose functions should be legislative, and whose sittings permanent. Some of these are of remarkable astuteness and subtlety.[1] Not long after this *coup de grâce* the *Holy Synod* was solemnly opened (February 25, 1721) by a discourse from its vice-president, Archbishop Theophanes. It was composed of eleven members, namely, a president, two vice-presidents, four councillors, and four assessors; but this number was increased to fourteen in 1722. The knowledge and capacity of the *first* members of this Synod, in whose selection the Tzar had exhibited an unusual degree of political prudence, gave to that body a consideration throughout the empire which it would not otherwise have been able to command. They were chosen from the most distinguished of the bishops, from the archimandrites, from the hegumenes of the principal convents, and from the protopopes. The Synod once established, as a necessary consequence the bonds uniting the Russian Church to that of the East were severed. Its every act was moulded to fit the policy of the Tzar, whose will was the supreme rule of action. Hence, on being likened to King Louis XIV., Peter might justly rejoin: "I think I have beaten the French King on one capital point; I have brought my clergy to obedience and peace. Louis has allowed himself to be subjugated by his" (?!)[2] The successors of Peter I. were hardly less pleased than himself with this creation of his genius, and appreciating its importance as an engine of state policy, were very careful to preserve it. Its influences were potent, sorrowful, and inevitable. From this time forth the Russian Church was in a condition of abject servitude; it became the mother of numerous sects, and ceased completely to exert any moral influ-

[1] 1. A synod is more capable than a single individual to form a judgment and to give decisions; 2. The decisions of such a body are of greater weight and more commanding authority than those of any one man; 3. As the synod convenes by the order and under the *supervision* of the *Tzar*, there need be no suspicion of either partiality or unfairness, as the Tzar will always put the public good before any private interest (?); 4. The transaction of business will not be interrupted either by disease or death; 5. In a synod like this, whose members are taken from the different orders, there is little ground to apprehend the influence either of passion or of corruption; 6. A number of persons participating in a single act will not be as easily deterred as an individual acting alone would be, from doing their duty, because in dread of the vengeance of the powerful; 7. Revolts and insurrections are for this reason prevented; 8. If the president of a synod makes mistakes or acts unwisely, he may be corrected by his brethren, but a patriarch would not submit his acts to the bishops subordinate to him; 9. A synodal government of this sort would become, in course of time, a nursery of able and distinguished ecclesiastics, and the assessors would in consequence acquire a knowledge of ecclesiastical administration.

[2] Such conduct, certainly, does not show any inclination on his part towards a union with the Catholic Church, as *Theiner* attempted to prove in his work, entitled "The Latest Phase of the Catholic Church in Poland and Russia."

ence over its members.[1] The most numerous sect that has sprung from it is that of the *Raskolniks*, or Separatists, but who style themselves *Starowierzi*, or Men of the Old Faith. There are many subdivisions of this sect, based upon trifling differences.[2]

PART SECOND.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO OUR OWN DAY (1789-1878).

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CONFLICT WITH FALSE POLITICAL THEORIES—THE NEGATIVE CHARACTER OF PROTESTANTISM GROWS DAILY MORE PRONOUNCED.

§ 386. *General Literature—Importance of Modern Church History.*

I. *Bullarii Romani continuatio summor. Pontificum *Clementis XIII.—Gregor. XVI.*, Rom., 1835, sq. Collectio Lacensis, acta et decreta Conc. recent., T. II. sq. For other documents and public papers, see *Müller's* Cyclopædia of Canon Law, and *Vater's* Structure of Modern Ch. H. See above, p. 1. *Huth*, † Essay on the Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., Augsburg, 1809. † Late Hist. of the Church of Christ, from the Accession of Pius VII. (1800) till the times of Gregory XVI. (1833), transl. fr. the Italian into German, 2nd ed., Augsburg, 1836. †*Robiano*, Continuation de l'Hist. ecclésiastique de Berault-Bercastel (1721-1830), Paris, 1836, 4 T. †*Gams*, Hist. of the Church in the Nineteenth Century, with Special Reference to Germany, being a continuation of *Bérault-Bercastel's* Ch. H., Innsbruck, 1853 sq., 3 vols. †*Rohrbacher*, Histoire univ. de l'église, T. 27 and 28. *Scharpf*, Lectures on Modern Ch. H., Freiburg, 1852. *Saint-George*, Le Christianisme au XIXe siècle, Paris, 1853. *Gieseler*, Ch. H., Vol. V. (fr. 1814 till a very recent date). *Hagenbach*, Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, Pt. II., 4th ed., Leipsig, 1872; Engl. tr. by *Hurst*, Vol. II., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Baur*, Ch. H. in the Nineteenth Century (Vol. V.). *Nippold*, Manual of Modern Ch. H., from 1814, Elberfeld, 1867.

For Political History: *Cesare Cantù*, Univ. Hist., Germ., by *Brühl*, Vol. XIII. †**Boost*, Modern Hist. of Mankind, from the Commencement of the French Revolution down to our own Days, Vol. I. (Hist. of France), 2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1843; Vol. II., Augsburg, 1843 (Hist. of Austria). *Leo*, Abridgment of Univ. Hist., Vols. IV. and V. *A. Alison*, History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution to the Restoration of the Bourbons, Edinburgh, 1833-1842; 10th ed., 14 vols, Edinburgh and London, 1861; German, by *Mayer*, 6 vols., Lps., 1842-1846; also transl. into Hindoostanee and Arabic; so is likewise the continuation of this work: "History of Europe, from the Fall of Napoleon to the Accession of Louis Napoleon," 6 vols., Edinb., 1852-1857; 7th vol., London, 1865. (Tr.) *Wolfgang Menzel*, Hist. of Europe, fr. the Commencement of the Fr. Revol., 1789-1815, 3rd ed., Stuttg., 1866, 2 vols.; by the *same*, Hist. of the Last Forty

---

[1] I have seen in Russia a Church which no one attacks, and which, to all appearance, everyone respects: a Church which, in the exercise of its moral authority, has every condition of success; and, nevertheless, this Church has absolutely no hold on the hearts of men; it produces hypocrites and persons given to superstition, but none others. (La Russie en 1839 par le Marquis *de Custine*, Bruxelles, 1844, T. IV., p. 434.)

[2] Cf., on these sects, *Aug. de Haxthausen*, Studies on the Internal Condition of Russia and on the Russian People, Hanover, 1847. II Pts. See "*The Catholic*," 1848, nro. 42.

Years, 1816-1856, and Hist of the Last One Hundred and Twenty Years, 1740-1830. *Louis Blanc*, Hist. de dixans, 1830-1840, Paris, 4 vols. (We recommend only the documentary proofs, not the spirit of the work.) Among the *Political Periodicals*, we offer for consultation, above all, The *Moniteur*, *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century, from 1801.

With the latter half of the present epoch the subject-matter of Church History approaches gradually nearer our own times, until finally it passes into the age in which we live, and with whose development and culture our life is, for better or worse, intimately connected. If the very nearness of the subject attracts us, its interest will grow upon us still more as we reflect that modern times are richer in events of extraordinary import and far-reaching consequences, whether in the civil or ecclesiastical domain, than any age in the past history of mankind, with perhaps not more than one or two exceptions, and therefore supply abundant and varied matter to the historian. A thorough and complete acquaintance with the religious condition, *internal* and *external*, of the Church during the passing and past years included in this interval is all the more necessary to the theologian, in that, as a pastor of souls, he is in daily contact with the practical affairs of life, and should at once help to revive and exert an influence upon religious principles and moral conduct; and this he cannot do if he possess not the information requisite to give meaning and purpose to his endeavours. If thoroughness of treatment be demanded in any portion of Church History, it is assuredly in that embracing the events of most recent times. Nor should the current objection "*that these times are not yet sufficiently full for such treatment, or that in treating of them some events must be either passed over entirely or drawn with a most skilful and delicate touch*," be allowed to have more than its just weight. The difficulty may be obviated if the historian beware of setting forth imperfectly developed events as complete and accomplished facts; and if, in touching upon affairs personal to those still living he do so only in so far as they are matter of historical fact. This was the method pursued by *Eusebius*, the Father of Church History, who sets forth the events of his own age with remarkable fulness. (Pref. to Bk. VIII.)

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM 1789-1878.

The French Revolution.

†*Barruel*, Collection ecclésiastique, ou recueil complet des ouvrages faits depuis l'ouverture des états généraux, relativement au clergé, 7 T.; Germ., Kempten, 1795-1797, 10 pts. By the *same*, Histoire du clergé de France pendant la révolution, Lond., 1794 and 1804; Germ., by *Collinet*, Frkft. and Lps. (Münster), 1794, 2 vols. Histoire du

clérgé en France pendant la révolution d'après Barruel, Montjoie, Picot, etc., par M. R. * * * Paris, 3 T. †*Carron*, Les confesseurs de la foi dans l'église gallicane à la fin du 18 siècle, Paris, 1820, 4 T.; Germ., by *Räss* and *Weis*, Mentz, 1822-1826, 4 vols. *Barruel*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme (1797 and 1803), Lyons, 1818 sq., 4 T. †*Jager*, Histoire de l'église de France pendant la révolution, Paris, 1852 sq., 3 T. *Boost*, Latest Hist. of France (1789-1835). *Wachsmuth*, Hist. of France during the Revolution, Hamburg, 1840, sq., 4 vols. †**Mazas*, Hist. of the French Revolution; Germ., by *Scherer;* with preface and additions by *Hoefler*, Ratisbon, 1842, two little volumes. *Polignac*, Jules, Prince de, Historical, Political, and Moral Studies; Germ., Ratisbon, 1846, 2 vols. †*Gaume*, The Revolution, being Hist. Researches on the Origin and Propagation of Bad Principles in Europe, from the Renaissance down to our own Times; Germ., Ratisbon, 1856 sq., 5 vols. *Burke*, Reflections on the Revolution of France, published in 1790; tr. into Fr. by *Dupont;* into Germ. by *Frederic v. Gentz*, Brunswick, 1838, 2 pts. (This work of Burke's, written in condemnation of the principles of 1789, led to an open rupture with Fox, his former political friend.—Tr.) *Alexis de Tocqueville*, L'ancien régime et la révolution, Paris, 1856. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 43, in two articles. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the French Revolution (to the republic), Lps. (1845) 1847. *Fr. v. Raumer*, Hist of France and the French Revolution, 1740-1795, Lps., 1850; **v. Sybel*, Hist of the Age of Revolution, from 1789-1795, Düsseldorf (1858), 1872, 4 vols. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd, Vol. IX., p. 251-289; Fr. tr., Vol. 20, p. 232-272.

A.—The Last Years of Pius VI., 1789-1800.

(*Hulot*), Collectio Brevium et Instr. Pii VI. ad præsentes Gallic Ecclesiæ calamitates, Aug., 1796, 2 T.; Lips., 1871, 2 T. Continuatio Bullarii, T. V.-X. *Baldassari*, Hist. of the Abduction and Imprisonment of Pius VI.; Germ., by *Steck*, Tueb., 1844; *Bissing*, France under Louis XVI., Freiburg, 1872.

§ 387. *The French National Assembly* (*La Consituante*), 1789-1791.

The consequences of the principles upon which the Reformation was based did not fully open upon the minds of men until they began to pass the line dividing the domain of religion from that of politics. The political event in which these principles were most thoroughly embodied, and in which, beyond doubt, they obtained their most complete illustration, was the French Revolution.[1] The early Reformers, Luther, Ulric von Hutten, Francis von Sickingen, and Thomas Münzer, inaugurated their religious reform by overturning the existing political order, and thence proceeded in their work of destruction to suppress monasteries by violence, to confiscate the property of the Church, and to secularize religious institutions in the name of princes. They subverted the authority of the *Church*, and, as a necessary consequence, the authority of the State fell with it. To a divine and unchangeable religion and to an infallible rule of faith and morals, succeeded, by an inevitable law, religious doubt, whence sprang the

[1] This view is steadily growing in favour, even with Protestants, and is openly set forth as the correct one by such distinguished writers as *Wolfgang Menzel*, *Henry Leo* (Vol. IV., p. 153), and others. There are many passages in the writings of *Mazas* which prove that he is also of this opinion. (Cf. Vol. I., pp. 115-201, and *Hoefler's* Preface.) *Louis Blanc* (Introd. to the Hist. of the French Revolution) and *Polignac* (L. c., Vol. I., p. 75) bear still more emphatic testimony to the same fact. The latter says: "At the breaking out of the French Revolution, wickedness, having worked its way up the scale of iniquity, had reached its climax; the prevailing heresy of Luther and Henry VIII. had commenced to make its influence felt; then succeeded religious indifference, unbelief, and finally revolt against God Himself, His commandments, and His laws." Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., and *Fehr*, Development and Influence of Political Theories, Innsbruck, 1855.

Deism of England, and, as time went on, a widespread moral corruption. The ideas of unrestrained liberty and absolute equality advocated by the French Jacobins were not new; they had been pro claimed with sufficient distinctness and in every variety of form by Münzer's rebellious peasants; while the members of the French Clubs found in the words and conduct of Luther an eloquent apology and model for their own contemptuous hatred of royalty. Moreover, the wit, the brilliancy, the multifarious scepticism, the fashionable unbelief, and easy morals of the splendid age of Louis XIV., had produced a luxuriant crop of authors, who perpetuated their errors in writings remarkable for attractive grace and classic elegance of style. Finally, Deists and materialistic philosophers, clumsy imitators of their English prototypes, encouraged by the debauchery of a depraved Court, and relying upon the protection of irreligious ministers, proceeded fearlessly to carry out their designs by outraging religion and undermining the principles of faith and morals. Of such were *Peter Bayle*, *Voltaire*, *D'Alembert*, *Diderot*, and *Jean Jacques Rousseau*, all working, each in his own way, for the utter annihilation of religion. It was Diderot that said, in a spirit of diabolical malignity, that if he were in need of a rope to hang the last king, he would make it of the entrails of the last priest.[1] Finally, as if to make a mockery of religion, a memoir was published of the frivolous Cardinal-Archbishop *Dubois*, formerly Prime Minister of France (†1723), revealing a shocking depth of moral depravity, such as might be expected in the life of one who held morality to be a prejudice of the multitude, and religion the invention of priests, and who in his dying moments repelled the grace of the sacraments.[2] The wicked designs of the philosophers and encyclopædists were still further advanced by the powerful influence of the mistresses, whom Louis XV. continued to keep in defiance of all decency, and by the universal tone of irreligion prevalent at Court. The clergy spoke out, *giving warning of the menacing dangers ahead;* but their words fell upon ears that would not hear.[3] To writings in which religion was outraged soon succeeded others in which *royalty* was contemptuously reviled.[4] With the thunder of such ominous forebodings as those already ringing in his ears, Louis XV. departed this life (May 10, 1774), with the presenti-

[1] Et avec les boyaux du dernier prêtre
Egorger le dernier des rois.

[2] *De la Houssaye-Pegeault*, Vie privée du Cardinal Dubois, 1789, 8vo.

[3] The Assembly of the Clergy, in a memorial to the king, dated July 20, 1789, gave utterance to these prophetic words: Encore quelques années de silence et l'ébranlement, devenu général, ne laissera plus apercevoir que des débris et des ruines. Apud *Robiano*, T. II., p. 53.

[4] To this class belongs the Philosophical History of the Commerce of the East and West Indies, by *Raynal*, which appeared in 1758. In this work the author formally states that the world will never enjoy peace until it has been ridded of priests and kings. In the second edition, published in 1781, the same hatred of authority and religion is expressed still more vehemently. To the same class belongs also the Marriage of Figaro, by *Beaumarchais*, a caustic satire on all authority whatever, in which the nobility are handled with exceptional severity. To these may be added a flood of pamphlets, bearing neither the author's nor the printer's name.

ment strong upon him that the crown would some day be struck from the head of his grandson. Some years later, when disorder became general and ruin imminent, the dastardly *Maurepas* cried out: "Would that things might remain as they are until we are gone."

Hardly a dozen years had gone by since the *expulsion of the Jesuits*, and impiety had already doubled, both in extent and intensity. A new generation of scholars, educated under new masters, and having hardly any religious knowledge, and certainly destitute of all religious habit and devotional feeling, had gone forth from the colleges to become active members of society. Revealed truth had been crushed out of men's minds to give room to a rationalistic philosophy and to unfounded prejudices; and the impiety, which had been heretofore confined to the inhabitants of the cities, began to find its way into the provinces and to permeate the rural populations. Was anyone bold or courageous enough to openly profess and practice his faith, his loyalty to his God became a subject of derisive mockery to his fellow-men.

Once the popular passions had been thus excited against both royalty and the Church, it is not wonderful that *the financial embarrassments and oppressive taxes*, necessarily resulting from a lavish expenditure of the public funds and a neglect to develop the material resources of the country, should rouse the jealousy of the Third Estate, or commoners, against the immunities enjoyed by the clergy and nobles, the more so as these had now lost much of their former consideration and prestige, and, though wealthy, contributed nothing, except by voluntary gift, towards defraying the ordinary expenses of Government.

The ideas of liberty imported from America; the enthusiasm naturally evoked by the successful struggle for independence in that country, to which France had so largely contributed in arms and money, and of which the young officers, on their return home, after sharing its trials and triumphs, were never tired of speaking in words of glowing eulogy, were like so many brands flung into a heap of inflammable matter. The impressionable genius of the French people, ever prompt to take up and ready to give a trial to whatever is new and strange, was fascinated by these ideas, and what was at first only a spark was rapidly transformed into a conflagration. Every measure taken to avert only served to hasten the crisis. The finances of the country were in a deplorable condition, and the efforts made by *Necker*, *Joly de Fleury*, and *Calonne*, who succeeded each other in the office of comptroller, to restore them, resulted only in increasing the yearly deficit. Calonne, conscious that a crisis was approaching, prevailed upon the king to call an *Assembly of Notables*, and on the 2nd of February, 1787, opened that body with a speech, proposing several reforms, among which were the abolition of some of the privileges of the Notables and a more equitable distribution of the burdens of taxation, and closing with the startling confession that the yearly deficit had gone on steadily increasing till it now amounted

to the sum of one hundred and fifteen millions of francs. The Notables refused to listen to the proposed reforms, and had Calonne disgracefully dismissed from his office, which was now given to Archbishop *Lomenie de Brienne*, who was shortly forced to resign, and the radical Necker was once more called to be Comptroller-General of Finance. The excitement had now spread from one end of France to the other, and both the Nobles and the Third Estate demanded, each for a different reason, the convocation of the *States-General*. The king for some time resisted the demand, but finally yielding, with ill grace, published the edict convoking the three estates to meet at Versailles, May 5, 1789, and, contrary to ancient usage, doubling the number of deputies representing the Third Estate. The excitement, which was steadily on the increase, was still further intensified by the general demoralization of the people, after passing through sufferings incident to an unusually rigorous winter and by the nearness of the place of meeting of the States-General to the city of Paris.[1] Moreover, it was well known that no reliance could be placed in the loyalty of the soldiers, who were daily to be seen in great crowds gathered about the Palais Royal, consorting with Radicals, and partaking of their hospitality. The States-General had barely assembled when the Third Estate demanded that the two orders of the nobles and clergy should unite with them to form one legislative body, and carry on their deliberations in a *common* chamber. This usage, though frequently followed since the restoration of the States-General under Philip the Fair, had been departed from in the last assembly, held in 1614, when the privileged Estates deliberated in one chamber, and the Third Estate in another. The demand was sternly resisted by the nobles and clergy, and equally sternly insisted upon by the Third Estate, who were somewhat emboldened by the encouragement they received from *Count Mirabeau*. Finally, on the 17th of June, after a stormy session, protracted long into the night, the Third Estate declared their own *the only lawful legislative body*, and of their own authority assumed the title of the *National Assembly*. This position had been long since boldly and persistently claimed for the representatives of the people by the *Abbé Sieyès*, Vicar-General of the diocese of Chartres, and the author of the famous pamphlet "*What is the Third Estate?*" The leading idea of the pamphlet is this: Nothing is more reasonable than that the majority should rule. What is unreasonable should cease to exist. Now, if the king and the privileged Estates continue to be unreasonable, the people should take things into their own hands.

Expelled from his own order, Abbé Sieyès was with difficulty chosen one of the deputies of the Third Estate by one of the colleges of Paris. The deputies were immediately joined by eight parish

[1] On the causes that led to the French Revolution, see *Ancillon*, who takes a temperate view, midway between the two extremes, Berlin, 1838, Vol. I., p. 249 sq.

priests, one of whom was the Abbé Grégoire,[1] and these were soon followed by one hundred and forty-eight more of the clergy, among whom were the Archbishops of Vienne and Bordeaux, the Bishops of Chartres, Coutance, and Rhodez, and *Talleyrand*, Bishop of Autun, who was really the leader of these disloyal ecclesiastics, and, by his personal influence, brought over to the liberal ranks one hundred and fifty of the priests of Paris. This was the man who subsequently ruled France for close upon half a century, and who held it to be an axiomatic principle in politics "that speech was given to man, not to make known, but to disguise his thoughts." The king having given his assent to the union of the *three* estates, the name of States-General was changed, June 19, 1789, into that of the *Constituent National Assembly;* and the Bourgeoisie, elated with the pride of victory and carried along with the spirit of revolution, broke through all restraint. On the 11th of July the *Marquis de Lafayette*, who, for services rendered in the War of American Independence, had been raised to the rank of general, brought forward the *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, which the more prudent *Mirabeau* wished to have deferred until after a constitution had been drawn up and adopted. His advice was disregarded, and, as a consequence of this precipitate action, a mob of fifty thousand men, on July 14, carried terror and dismay to every quarter of Paris; and, directed their steps to the Porte St. Antoine, where the *Bastille*, built by order of Charles V. as a defence against the English, was situated. Having effected an entrance, they were astonished to find only a few prisoners in the dungeons, where it was popularly believed there were scores; but so great was their hatred of this historical pile, on account of the eminence of the prisoners that had languished there, that on the following day they utterly demolished it. The National Assembly was not slow in usurping *political* power, and soon revealed its intentions of seizing the possessions of both the nobility and the clergy. The latter evinced a very conciliatory temper, and on the memorable night of the 4th of August came generously forward, offering to subscribe to any measures that might be thought necessary to liquidate the public debt. While the nobles expressed a readiness to lay aside their titles and the privileges of their order, the clergy signified their willingness to pay taxes upon church property, to surrender the tithes for a compensation, and to relinquish the surplice-fees and other perquisites. The *Jansenists* had hoped that the Church would emerge out of these troubles purified and more spiritual. When, on the 10th of August, these questions came up for discussion, the Archbishop of Paris, who for ten years had been styled the father of the poor, speaking in the name of the whole clergy, demanded that, in compensation for the tithes, some

[1] Memoires de Grégoire († 1831), précédés d'une notice historique sur l'auteur, par *M. H. Carnot*, Paris, 1837, 2 vols.; *Krüger*, Grégoire, according to his Memoirs, with a preface by *Chas. Hase*, Lps., 1838. Cf. The Tuebingen Quarterly Review, 1838, nro. 4, p. 720-741.

adequate provision be made for the proper **maintenance of religion**; that virtuous and zealous priests be set over the churches; that in the future, as in the past, the wants of the poor should not be neglected; and that, as there was at present no means of relieving them, the abolition of the tithes should be put off until such time as an appropriation from the public treasury could be set apart for this purpose, as well as for the support of the clergy. To these wise suggestions no answer other than a vague promise was given. A yearly income of seventy millions of francs was confiscated at a blow; and every individual of the privileged estates, excepting only such pastors and vicars as had barely a decent support (*portio congrua*), were subjected to an impost to go into immediate effect and to date back to the 1st of April, 1789.

The Assembly next took up the question of *religious liberty*, and, by a vote, taken August 23, decided that in future every one should be free to hold what opinions, even in religion, he might see fit, provided only that in propagating them he did not violate either public peace or public law. It was plain that the aim of this measure was to *decatholicize France*, which even *Mirabeau* held to be necessary on the ground that Catholicity and freedom are mutually incompatible! *The Declaration of the Rights of Man* was adopted August 26. The distress was steadily on the increase, and fresh sacrifices were demanded. Following the precedents of former ages, the noble Archbishop of Paris proposed to melt down all the sacred vessels not absolutely necessary to public worship, and to apply the proceeds to the paying off of the public debt. This generous offer was somewhat embarrassing to the Revolutionists, who, desirous of reducing the clergy to a condition of dependence by robbing them of their possessions, nevertheless felt that to do so would appear little short of criminal. But any infirmity of this kind of which their consciences may still have been susceptible was speedily repaired by the boldness of the Bishop of Autun, who, on the 10th of October, brought forward a measure stating *that all ecclesiastical possessions ought to be declared national property, confiscated, and applied to the extinction of the public debt.* Neither the wise and temperate counsel of *Montesquiou*, nor the impassioned eloquence of *Maury*, nor yet the indignant rebuke of *Sieyès* himself, who, rising in his place in the Assembly, cried out, "You wish to be free, and you know not how to be just," could prevent the consummation of a financial measure at once so iniquitous and so replete with danger. On the 2nd of November a decree passed the Assembly, placing all the property of the Church at the disposal of the Nation, and promising to make decent provision for the cost of worship, the support of the clergy, and the relief of the poor! During the discussion of this decree the hall of the Assembly was surrounded by an armed mob, crying out in menacing tones, "*that if the decision were favourable to the clergy the bishops and priests should be put to death.*" On the 19th of December following, ecclesiastical property to the value of two hundred million of francs was seques-

trated, put on sale, and declared to belong to the Nation. The violent measures enacted within the hall of the National Assembly were decorous and temperate, compared with what took place outside its walls The tumultuous shouts of the deputies during their deliberations were caught up and sent back in fuller volume and greater intensity by the howling mob in the streets. After the taking of the Bastille, many regiments threw off the restraints of military discipline, and were with the greatest difficulty again reduced to obedience. The National Assembly now practically took the control of the army out of the hands of the king, by prescribing a new form of oath for the soldiers, according to which they bound themselves to obey the Nation first and next the Crown, and never to use violence against their fellow-citizens. The throne was betrayed by the *Duke of Orleans*. From every street corner cheers went up for the "*Declaration of the Rights of Man*." Finally, on the 5th and 6th of October, a savage rabble, accompanied by members of the National Guard, raised the cry of "*Bread, on to Versailles!*" and, having arrived there, attacked the royal residence, and forced the king and the royal family to transfer their abode to Paris, whither the Assembly also followed. From this time forth the Revolution became inevitable; and the action of three hundred of the deputies, embracing all the more respectable members of the Assembly, who quitted Paris to avoid participating in the crimes which they saw would soon be perpetrated, only hastened the crisis. The Jacobins and patriots, who now openly proclaimed their intentions, and the Duke of Orleans, the leader of the Freemasons,[1] having no longer any reasonable cause of fear, set earnestly to work to carry into effect their long-meditated and audacious projects. On motion of the lawyer *Treilhard*, who asserted that the convent was the abode of tyranny, the prison of sorrowing hearts suffering in silence, and the scene of disorderly festivity and every sort of crime, the *monastic Orders* were abolished (February 13, 1790), and, as a compensation to the plundered monks and nuns, a miserable pittance, subsequently reduced to one-third the original sum, and even this never regularly paid, was granted to each. Then, as in the sixteenth century, under Luther, might be seen troops of monks, though by no means so numerous as had been anticipated, carried away by the fury of the revolutionary torrent, several of them, like *Fouché* and *Chabot*, becoming the fiercest of Terrorists. On the 14th of April the entire administration of ecclesiastical property was handed over to the secular authorities, in spite of the spirited protest of the Abbé *Grégoire*, with the understanding that the administrators were to pay a salary to each member of the clergy, that of a parish priest being set at twelve hundred francs, with the use of a house and garden. But before securing this indemnity to the clergy, or even granting them what was absolutely necessary for their subsistence, an attempt was

[1] For the influence of the Order of Freemasons on the French Revolution, see *Barruel*, Mémoires, T. II., p. 257 sq., &c. *Polignac*, Hist., Polit., and Religious Studies, Vol. I., p. 56 sq.

made to enslave them by forcing upon their acceptance the decree of July 12, 1790, known as the *Civil Constitution of the Clergy.* Not content with plundering the Church, they wished *to destroy her very constitution*, and thereby *decatholicize* France. It was decreed that there should be a bishopric for each of the departments into which the country had been recently divided, thus reducing the number of dioceses from one hundred and thirty-six to eighty-three;[1] that chapters should be suppressed, and all benefices, abbacies, and priories confiscated; that bishops and parish priests should receive their appointments from the departmental electoral assemblies, composed of Catholics, Calvinists, and Jews; that bishops so appointed should dispense with the confirmation of the Pope, and receive investiture from the metropolitan, himself chosen in the same way; that as a matter of courtesy they might inform the Holy See by letter of their appointment; and, finally, that previously to being consecrated, they should, in the presence of the king, the municipality, the clergy, and the people, take the oath of allegiance to the Nation, the laws, and the king. The bishop was now only the parish priest of his cathedral; the parish priests of the other churches within his diocese composed his council, and according to their advice and judgment he was bound to be directed in the exercise of his authority; all dignities and prebends of cathedrals and collegiate chapters were declared extinct; and, finally, all foreign bishops were forbidden to meddle in the affairs of the Church of France; but, with great difficulty, the Abbé Grégoire succeeded in having a modification introduced into the last clause, disclaiming any intention of prejudicing the existing union with the Visible Head of the Church. Such is the decree called by a misnomer the *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*, as if their civil rights were at all in question.[2] The bishops entered their protest against the Constitution, earnestly demanding the convocation of a national or provincial synod; and the Abbé *Maury* pleaded eloquently to avert so great a disaster as this measure would inevitably bring upon France. Protests and pleadings were vain, and it was decreed that those performing ecclesiastical functions and refusing to take the oath to the civil constitution should be dismissed. The king, at whose request the affair was referred by the Holy Father to the judgment of De Pompignan, Archbishop of Vienne, and De Cicé, Archbishop of Bordeaux, long hesitated to sign the decree; but finally, on December 27, consented to yield, after the two prelates, with deplorable weakness, had advised the unqualified acceptance of the measure.

On motion of *Barnave*, a Protestant, it was enacted (January, 1791) that bishops and priests declining to take the oath to the Civil

[1] The reader will find in *Mazas*, Vol. I., p. 67 sq., a list of the eighteen archbishoprics and one hundred and eight suffragan bishoprics, which still existed in 1789. He also gives a statement of the primitive revenues of the five sees dependent on the Metropolitan of Treves, and five others, forming the dioceses of Corsica. See, above all, *Dictionnaire de statisque religieuse*, published by *M. Migne*, Paris, Petit-Montrouge, 1851.

[2] *Sciout*, Histoire de la constitution du clergé (1790-1802), avec de nombreux documents inédits, Paris, 1873, 2 vols.

Constitution should, besides being deprived of their charges, be prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace, if they continued to exercise their functions. Scarcely had the decree been published when it was enforced in regard to the clerical members of the Assembly. Of the three hundred ecclesiastical deputies, about eighty consented to take the required oath, and these more from interest than conviction; and of the one hundred and thirty-six bishops of France, only four were to be found faithless to their trust. These were *Talleyrand,* Bishop of Autun; *Savines,* Bishop of Viviers; *Jarente,* Bishop of Orleans; and *Loménie de Brienne,* Archbishop of Sens. The Abbé Grégoire, in an address, explained the oath, and after setting forth the motives, which he thought sufficient to justify one in taking it, was the *first* ecclesiastic to swear obedience to the schismatical Constitution. At least fifty of the sixty thousand pastors and vicars then in France absolutely refused to take the oath. Those who took it were called *Assermentés* or *Jurors,* and those who refused *Insermentés* or *Non-jurors.* Many of those who took the oath did so because they had been intimidated or were ignorant of its real drift, and subsequently retracted; and many more sought to evade its import by explaining it away and putting their own interpretation upon it. Henceforth every priest was under suspicion; and although, as *Condorcet* said, there was no desire to make martyrs of them, their lives were daily threatened. Finally, as if at pains to leave no doubts concerning its religious views, the Assembly, by a decree of April 4, 1791, transformed the *Church of Sainte-Geneviève into a Pantheon,* or mausoleum, for the heroes and great men of France; and here *Mirabeau* was buried, and the remains of *Voltaire* and *Rousseau* subsequently transferred with great pomp. The non-juring clergy were uniformly ordered to vacate their charges, which were then given to the constitutional clergy, consisting for the most part of apostate monks, fiery Revolutionists, and clerical refugees from Holland and Germany. About twenty parish priests, who had exhibited in their persons shameless examples of perjury by taking the oath in the presence of the Assembly, were rewarded with bishoprics. One of them, the Abbé Grégoire, was set over the diocese of Blois, while Thémines, the lawful bishop, was still alive. To the king, who had done so much for this apostate priest, he showed his gratitude by demanding, *after the discovery of the flight of the royal family* by the postmaster of Varennes, the abolition of the prerogative of inviolability, which until that time had surrounded the royal person, and proposing to have him put on trial for his life. He appointed as his vicar-general *Chabot,* an infamous Capuchin friar, who, if possible, surpassed in cruelty even *Marat* himself. The first constitutional bishops were consecrated by Talleyrand, and these in turn consecrated others, all of whom took possession of their sees without the necessary permission of the Holy See. In April, 1791, Pope *Pius VI.* rejected the Constitution, declared the appointment of new bishops to sees illegal and of no effect, and suspended from the exercise of their functions those already consecrated. Many ecclesiastics retracted,

submitted to the authority of the Head of the Church, and had their disabilities removed, thus escaping the scornful contempt with which the constitutional bishops and priests were regarded by the bulk of the people, who, to the surprise of many, were still warmly attached to the old faith. To avenge itself upon the Pope, the National Assembly, on the 14th of September, declared, amid thunders of applause, the counties of *Avignon* and *Venaissin* annexed to France. As an initial token of the tender and beneficent care which the happy and peaceful inhabitants of the counties were to expect from their new masters, a mob, led by *Jourdan*, surnamed the *Beheader*, went about the streets of Avignon murdering men, women, and children in cold blood, and then, as if to put a fitting finish upon their atrocious deeds, drove one hundred and ten victims, many of whom were children and defenceless females, into the tower of the palace formerly occupied by the Popes, and chucked them, wounded, dead, and dying as they were, into a well, called the *Glacière* or ice-pit, after which they threw in a quantity of quicklime and water.[1]

In Paris an effigy of the Pope, after having been paraded through the streets of the city, sitting on an ass, and holding in its hands the figure of a bull, was removed and burned amid the brutal jests of the mob.

The constitutional bishops and priests were by no means at one as to the line of policy they should pursue. Some wholly disregared the numerous papal briefs affecting themselves; others affected to doubt their existence; and still others endeavoured to persuade their parishioners that the new Constitution in no way clashed with the truths of faith or the discipline of the Church; that one might be a juror and at the same time a good Christian or an orthodox priest; and that in taking the oath they did so from the purest and most loyal of motives, and with no desire to outrage religion or the rights of the Holy See. But these fallacious assurances produced no effect, and were received by the faithful as being only the insidious echoes of the instructions which the National Assembly had addressed to the people on the 21st of January, 1791, on the subject of the Civil Constitution. When persuasion would not accomplish their purposes, these apostles of reason very characteristically had recourse to threats and violence. Catholics who chose to remain loyal to their faith were persecuted, and non-juring ecclesiastics were cast into prison, driven from their respective dioceses, and banished the country.

§ 388. *Legislative Assembly* (1791-1792)—*National Convention* (September 21, 1792-October, 1795)—*Directory* (1796-1799)—*Consulate* (November 9, 1799)—*Theophilanthropists.*

The Constituent Assembly closed its sittings, September 30, 1791, and the *Legislative Assembly*, as the next body was called, met October 1

[1] *Henry Martin*, in his History of France (Boston, Vol. I., pp. 208, 209), gives the details of this brutal butchery with a tone, if not of absolute approval, certainly not of condemnation. His work is intensely bigoted, and as an authority utterly worthless. (Tr.)

This Assembly, acting under the inspiration of *Robespierre*, *Danton*, and *Marat*, carried out the principles of the Revolution with a logical rigour that was terrific and an impiety that was literally satanic. Ecclesiastics were forbidden to wear the dress of their order, and those of them, who refused to take the oath to the Civil Constitution, after having been already imprisoned and borne all manner of persecution for their heroic resistance, were now condemned to perpetual banishment. Louis XVI. declined to sanction the severe measures against the clergy, and, as long as he was free to choose his own spiritual attendants, closed the doors of the royal chapel in the face of the constitutional priests. His refusal was the occasion of a popular outbreak. The king was shortly after deposed and imprisoned in the Temple, and the decree against the clergy carried out in its extremest rigour. Although six hundred priests had been slaughtered at Avignon by the soldiers of Jourdan, the Beheader, they still heroically refused to take the oath. It was therefore resolved, on the very day of the king's imprisonment, August 13, 1792, to exterminate every Catholic priest in Paris. Under pretence of subsequently banishing them, the priests were searched for in every part of Paris, by order of the municipal authorities, and, when found, imprisoned in various quarters of the city. But, on the 2nd of September, when news reached the city that the Prussians had already, entered Champagne, and were intent upon releasing the king and restoring his authority, a band of three hundred assassins, hired by the municipality of Paris, visited the various prisons, and, among other victims, massacred, amid scenes of revolting barbarity, three hundred ecclesiastics, including one archbishop and two bishops. The atrocities perpetrated in Paris were repeated at Meaux, Châlons, Rennes, and Lyons.[1] The carnival of blood continued for four days, during which eight thousand French citizens were put to death in Paris alone; and this wholesale assassination was characterized by the apologists of the Revolution as the shedding of the blood of a few *traitors!* One of the members of the Legislative Assembly declared publicly in one of the sessions "*that the one sorrow he would carry with him to the grave was that of having to leave behind him a religion existing on earth!*" Such of the priests as had been fortunate enough to escape the knife of the assassin quitted their parishes and went into voluntary exile. But these *emigrants* were not forsaken of God in a strange land. They were received with generous hospitality in Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, and England. After getting through with persecuting priests, the legislators of the Assembly turned their attention to the protection of prostitutes; and those who had spoiled the Church and plundered ecclesiastics now voted a handsome sum for the relief of pregnant women of bad repute. They also legalized

[1] Cf. The Christian Heroes in the French Revolution, tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ., Mentz, 1820, and Abbé *Carron's* work, The Confessors of the Faith, quoted above at the heading of § 386. The Germ. transl. contains additions from *Guillon*, Les martyrs de la foi pendant la révolution française, Paris, 1821, 4 T.

divorce, and, as a consequence, within the short space of two years, five thousand nine hundred marriages were dissolved in the city of Paris alone.

At the breaking out of the French Revolution, nearly all the princes of Europe remained for a time passive spectators, while the most sacred rights were being outraged,[1] and seemed to take no interest in what so nearly concerned themselves, until finally Leopold, Emperor of Austria, and Frederic William, King of Prussia, after a meeting at Pilnitz, in August, 1791, issued a manifesto, declaring that they regarded the cause of Louis as their own, and calling upon all European princes to aid them in re-establishing law and order in France. In the meantime Leopold died, and was succeeded by Francis II., whose minister, Kaunitz, sent an ultimatum to Paris, demanding the re-establishment of the monarchy in all its rights, the restoration of the counties of Avignon and Venaissin to the Pope, and the surrender of the confiscated church property in France. The Assembly received this extraordinary demand with feelings of indignation; and, with a daring that was all the more energetic and formidable because of its very recklessness, immediately declared war and openly defied all the enemies of France (April 20, 1792). This step was also necessary in order to change the fervid enthusiasm of the people in favour of liberty into a passion for war, and to anticipate and if possible prevent a coalition of all the powers of Europe against France and the Revolution. It would seem, says Boost, that there is an analogy between the physical and the spiritual laws in nature, and that the rapidity of a nation's descent, in morals and religion, once it has been started on its downward course, is accurately expressed by the law of geometrical progression governing falling bodies. Accordingly, the bulk of the French people, following the teaching of false philosophers and the example of those who were socially and intellectually their superiors, cut loose from the Church, abandoned God, and having entered upon a downward course, dashed with blind fury into the most abominable excesses.

The direction of the Revolution had now passed into the hands of a mob, composed of the vilest of the vile, who recognizing no rights in others, and outraging what every honest man held to be sacred, pretended that they were desirous of making all equal, when their only purpose was to bend the necks of others beneath their own yoke. The promised liberty and equality, Frenchmen learned to their cost, were nowhere to be found except on the field of battle, on the scaffold, and in the grave; and the boasted fraternity, which was to bind together all mankind in one common family, existed only among the members of the Clubs, and its bond was a common hatred of all the human race besides themselves.

In the *National Convention*, which met September 21, 1792, Marat, Danton, and Robespierre, who had hitherto affected a certain modesty

[1] *Mazas*, Vol. I., p. 244, especially in the Appendix, pp. 335-380.

in pushing themselves to the front, now threw off all disguise, and at once took the government into their own hands. *Royalty* was forthwith abolished, the king was next brought to trial, condemned, and beheaded, January 21, 1793. Against this judicial *murder by Frenchmen of one of the best of French kings* no determined opposition was made in the Convention, which was chiefly composed of Jacobins and Girondists. "I forgive the authors of my death," said this descendant of St. Louis with his last breath; "may my blood never be avenged upon France." These noble words will remain for all time a splendid testimony to the magnanimity and Christian resignation of this unfortunate prince. His queen, *Maria Antoinette*, the daughter of Maria Teresa, carried herself during the last days of her life, and amid the trying scenes of execution, with the heroic fortitude of a martyr and the calm dignity of a saint. The death of the king was the signal for a fresh and still more bloody persecution of the clergy, for a civil war of unparalleled barbarity, and for a series of proscriptions that included in their lists all that was great and noble and virtuous in France. Forty-four thousand Revolutionary Tribunals were established, and an equal number of guillotines set up over the face of the country, and a flying column of six thousand soldiers went up and down the land clearing it of every trace of both monarchical and aristocratic institutions. Amid the general destruction of whatever at any time contributed to the greatness and glory of France, *Christianity could not escape.* It was declared to be *of purely human invention and the persistent foe of freedom.* By the decree of 1792, granting universal toleration to every form of worship, Christianity *alone* was excepted. The philosophical principles that had been made familiar to the people were carried out to their last consequences in practice. Priests, against whom no charge could be brought except their heroic fidelity to duty, were brutally murdered; churches were profaned, pillaged, and, when not demolished, either sold or converted into "*Temples of Reason;*" the Gregorian Calendar was abolished and replaced by the Revolutionary Era, commencing September 22, 1792, the *Decades* and the Revolutionary feasts;[1] marriage was declared a civil contract and nothing more; Christianity was abolished by a decree of November 7, 1793; *the worship of the Goddess of Reason* was established; the *existence of God* was publicly *denied;* and the last resting-places of the dead were violated, made desolate, and a card posted at the entrances bore the inscription: "*Death is but a perpetual sleep.*" Such are some of the results that succeeded each other with startling rapidity, once the Revolutionary movement had got fairly under way. The conduct of the constitutional clergy was simply deplorable. *Gobel*, the Constitutional Bishop of Paris, entered the hall of the Convention, followed by his clergy, on the 7th of November, 1793, and there, as if unconscious or heedless of the stain he was putting upon his own and their characters, openly declared that up

[1] *Leo*, Manual of Univ. Ch. Hist., Vol. V., p. 88, but particularly pp. 114-117.

to that time they had been duping the people and teaching a religion which they themselves believed to be false. "The people," said he, "want no public or national worship other than that of *liberty and equality*, and I bow my will to theirs, and here, upon the altar of my country, lay down my ring and crosier." While uttering these words, Gobel and the thirteen vicars, who followed his example, trampled under foot the tokens of their ministry, and in place of his mitre the unworthy bishop put upon his head the *red cap* or Phrygian bonnet.[1] Many of the constitutional clergy took wives, and one of them went the length of trampling the crucifix under foot, crying out in the meantime: "It is not enough to destroy the tyrant of the body, let us also crush out the tyrant of the soul." Finally, on the 20th Brumaire (November 10, 1793) was celebrated in the venerable cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris the *feast of the Goddess of Reason*, personified by an opera singer of infamous character, borne aloft on a species of throne, with the crucifix under her feet, and escorted to the church by legislators and philosophers, where, seated upon the altar and enveloped in a cloud of incense, she listened with grotesque composure while a crowd of amiable maniacs sang Chenier's hymn of liberty in her honour. Those who had been most fanatically opposed to the veneration of the saints became now the most enthusiastic proselytes of the new worship. They had a most tender reverence for the periwig and snuff-box of Rousseau, the sword of Mirabeau, and the hair that once adorned the fur robe of Voltaire.

A Consecrated Host, stolen from one of the churches, was carried in procession through the streets, amid the derisive jests and shocking profanity of the mob. As is always inevitably the case, schism produced heresy, and from this speedily followed atheism and paganism. Still irreligion was by no means general in France. *Brittany*, *Anjou*, and *Poitou* still nourished a noble race of men, *a veritable generation of giants*, who made a gallant and heroic stand for their king and the faith of their fathers. The Vendeans, though vanquished, had not fought in vain,[2] for the Revolutionary government was forced to grant them an honourable peace and *freedom of religious worship*. But the Reign of Terror did not on this account bear less heavily on the inhabitants of the other provinces of France. Anyone known to conceal a non-juring priest, on whose head a price was set, was liable to a large fine. The triumph of the Goddess of Reason was shortlived. Through the influence of Robespierre, the National Convention passed a decree recognizing the *existence of a Supreme Being* (*être suprême*), and professing a belief in the *immortality of the soul*. On the 8th of July, 1794, a magnificent and grotesque fête was celebrated in honour of the Supreme Being, over which Robespierre presided as high-priest,

[1] He was soon overtaken by divine justice, and died on the scaffold, April 13, 1794. In his prison he was touched by divine grace, and repented, exhibiting signs of deep sorrow for his sins and the scandal he had brought upon his holy religion. *Feller*. Dictionnaire historique, art. "Gobel."

[2] Cf. *Mazas*, Vol. II., pp. 131 sq., La guerre de la Vendée.

and was treated by the multitude almost as a demigod. There was never an age in the history of the world in which retributive justice was so swift to overtake the authors of crime as in this. And the most remarkable feature of their downfall and punishment is that these were invariably brought about by the *same* agents that had contributed to their elevation.

The Duke of Orleans, who sat in the Convention under the name of *Philip Egalité*, and who, though a near kinsman of the king, voted for his death amid a murmur of horror and disgust, being one of the suspected *Republican* deputies, lost his head, November 6, 1793; *Marat* was stabbed to the heart by Charlotte Corday, who had come all the way from Caen to Paris to do the deed; *Danton* was beheaded, April 5, 1794; and, finally, *Robespierre*, when at the height of his power, was conspired against by the very members of the Committee of Public Safety, followed into the Hôtel de Ville, and, when arrested, shot himself in the jaw in attempting to take his own life. Taken thence to the hall of the Convention, where, stretched upon a table, it is said the very clerks inhumanly pricked him with their penknives, he was condemned, and finally guillotined, July 28, 1794, amidst the vociferous execrations of the multitude, who, a little more than a month before had honoured him as a demigod. Those who took the most conspicuous part in the Reign of Terror were nearly all guillotined on the very spot where their victims had suffered. After the fall of Robespierre the Convention returned to wiser and more temperate counsels. *Lecointre*, ascending the tribune in the hall of the Convention, courageously proclaimed "*that a people without a religion, without a worship, and without a Church, is a people without a country and without a morality, destined inevitably to sink to the condition of slaves; that contempt of religion had been the ruin of the French monarchy, and would be the ruin of every people whose legislation is not founded on the unchangeable principles of morality and religion.*" The decree of 1795, authorizing the exercise of Catholic worship in those churches not already alienated, was hailed by all wise and good Frenchmen as a great blessing.

Everyone felt it a great relief, after the frightful days of the Reign of Terror, to be able to breathe freely once more, and to give expression to those exalted yet peremptory aspirations of the soul, which they had been obliged for so long to repress. "How delightful," said *Mercier* "is Christianity after the moral code of Robespierre, Marat, and their colleagues! After such scenes of blood and horror, how great need have we that some one should speak to us of the God of peace!" Ecclesiastics were now only required to promise obedience to the laws of the Republic, and to recognize the principle of popular sovereignty. These concessions were the occasion of fresh persecutions, for even the terrible visitations of divine justice that had overtaken the Duke of Orleans, Mirabeau, Danton, Robespierre, Chabot, Gobel, and others, had not yet awakened in the minds of most Frenchmen a desire of returning to the Church of God.

The irreligion resulting from the rejection of Christianity began now to develop itself under another form. Under the patronage of the Directory (1796) a sect sprung up, known as *Theophilanthropists*,[1] composed of Jacobins, married priests, former members of clubs, and orators of political factions. This sect, which at first consisted only of five heads of families, who held meetings at irregular intervals,[2] after obtaining the protection of *La Réveillère-Lépaux*, gradually increased in numbers, got possession through its patron, who was one of the five members of the Directory, of ten of the parish churches of Paris, and was received with favour in some of the provincial towns. The pure Deism professed by the sectaries could not hold its ground against cold Rationalism on the one hand, or against the fervid earnestness of Christianity on the other. Pursued by the biting sarcasm of a scoffing public, Philanthropism passed out of sight, once its novelty had worn away, and was no more heard of after the *First Consul* had forbidden its professors, on the overthrow of the Directory, to exercise their worship in the churches. Although the nation had again returned to the true faith, the orthodox and loyal clergy had to put up with many annoyances from the more numerous constitutional ecclesiastics, who did everything in their power to impede the exercise of their jurisdiction. At a synod held in Paris (from Aug. 25, 1797), under the presidency of Bishop Grégoire, they partially revived the civil constitution of the clergy.

§ 389. *The Roman Republic.*

The civil constitution had been condemned by Pius VI. in the bull *Caritas*, and the clergy forbidden to take the required oath. After war had broken out between France and the other European powers, the Pope also levied an army for the defence of the Pontifical States. Such precautions gave offence to the French Government, which, after the victorious campaign of Napoleon in Upper Italy against Austria, Sardinia, and Naples, declared war against the Holy See; and Pius VI. was in consequence obliged to accept an armistice, concluded in his name by Azara, the Spanish ambassador; to surrender the Legation of Urbino, and to pay a war contribution of twenty-one millions of francs (1796). The Pope having resisted the demand made by Bonaparte to withdraw all the briefs issued against France, the armistice was declared at an end (February 1, 1797). By a threatened advance upon Rome, Napoleon extorted from the Pope, by the Treaty of *Tolentino*, 19th February, 1797, the cession of the counties of *Avignon* and *Venaissin* to France, and of the Legations of *Bologna*,

[1] They were also styled "*Theanthropophiles*," i.e., friends of God and men. See Manual des Théophiles, Paris, 1797 (Germ., by *Friedel*, Mentz, 1798); Année religieuse des Théophilanthropes (recueil des discours), Paris, 1797; *Grégoire*, Histoire des Theophilanthropes (Germ., by *Stäudlin*, Hanover, 1806).

[2] It existed in England from the year 1776, where it was started by Franklin and Williams. (Tr.)

Ferrara, and *Romagna* to the Cisalpine Republic. Besides these valuable provinces, the conqueror levied another heavy war contribution of thirty-one millions of francs, and plundered the libraries and galleries of Rome of some of the rarest manuscripts and most valuable treasures of art. These conditions brought the papal government to the very verge of ruin, although Napoleon declared "that he had given Europe an example of the moderation of the Directory." The peace did not last long. While the papal troops were engaged in putting down an insurrection in Rome, which the French had industriously encouraged, General *Duphot*, an *attaché* of the French embassy, was killed (December 28); and the Directory at once ordered General *Berthier* to advance upon Rome, which he entered without opposition, February 10, 1798, and five days later *proclaimed a Republic.*

The popular party were as servile in their flattery of the French general as they were base and cruel in their treatment of the Sovereign Pontiff. A statue of the goddess of liberty, tramping under foot the tiara and other symbols of religion, was set up at one of the entrances to the bridge of St. Angelo; the papal insignia were derisively painted upon the drop-curtain in the theatre Aliberti; and the sacred vessels stolen from the altars were made to do service at the infamous orgies celebrated in honour of the Republic. To the thoughtful and better class of Romans these excesses showed how vitally important it was that the Holy Father should not leave the city. The Pope, on his part, fully appreciated his duty, and determined not to shrink from it. Having taken his resolution to stay with the people, the courageous octogenarian[1] refused to leave Rome until he was dragged from the Vatican by main force (February 20, 1798). He was next carried away to *Siena*, where he was lodged in the Augustinian monastery, and thence transferred to the Carthusian monastery of *Florence*. But the tender expressions of sympathy and respect which he received from the inhabitants roused the jealousy and excited the alarm of the philosophers and the Directory, and it was determined to send the grand old man either to Spain or Sardinia. This project was rendered impracticable by the breaking out of war, and the Pope, though in infirm health, was carried to Grenoble, whence, after a stay of twenty-five days, he was removed to Valence on the Rhône, and orders had already been given to move him on to Dijon, when, worn out by the rigour of his confinement, he passed peacefully away, August 22, 1799, in the eighty-second year of his age, thus escaping the trials of a fresh exile. He was in truth a "*Peregrinus Apostolicus moriens in exilio*," and his last words were worthy the Vicar of Jesus Christ. "May my successor," said he, "whoever he may be, forgive the French as sincerely as I do."

The few trifling articles which the Holy Father had distributed as mementoes and tokens of his gratitude to the faithful servants who had followed him into exile were seized by the French Government and sold as *national property*. Such was the fear inspired by a government which claimed to be free and popular that the people did not dare even to bury the mortal remains of the holy Pontiff until an authorization had been sent to do so. His body was not interred until several months later, when Bonaparte, by a *Consular* decree, dated December 30, 1799, granted the required permission. Two years later, February 17, 1802, his remains were taken to Rome, and laid away in the Basilica of St. Peter, amid universal tokens of respect and mingled expressions of joy and sorrow.[2]

---

[1] What a grand spectacle is Pius VI., when, with a firmness that few believe him capable of, he sternly resolves to remain near the Tomb of the Apostles and the Mother Church of Christendom, and there abide his fate? Would to God that the noble old man, now above eighty years of age, might be permitted to rest where he has spent a pontificate of two-and-twenty years, and borne up under the bitter trials God has sent upon him." *John von Müller*, Autobiography, letter of March 4, 1797 (Complete Works, Vol. XXXI., p. 187). Cf., also, the memorable words of *Saracin*, of Geneva (New Hist. of the Church of Christ, 2nd ed., Vol. I., pp. 66-68).

[2] Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. I., pp. 152-156.

B. § 390. *Pontificate of Pius VII.* (March 14, 1800—August 21, 1823).

Continuatio Bullarii Rom. Pontificum Clementis XIII.—Gregor. XVI., T. XI.-XV. (Caprara) Concordat entre le gouvernement français et le pape, Paris, 1802. *Theiner*, Histoire des deux concordats conclus en 1801 et en 1813, Paris, 1869, 2 vols.; in opposition, *Crétineau-Joly*, Bonaparte et le concordat de 1801 et le Cardinal Consalvi, Paris, 1869. *Barruel*, Du pape et de ses droits relig. à l'occasion du concordat, Paris, 1803. *De Pradt*, Les quatre Concordats, Paris, 1818, 2 vols. Comte *d'Haussonville*, L'église romaine et le premier empire avec notes et correspond. diplomat., Paris, 1872. †*Artaud de Montor*, Histoire de la vie et du pontificat du pape Pie VII., 2 vols., Paris, 1837; tr. into English and Germ., Vienna, 2 vols. †Cardinal *Pacca*, Memorie storiche, Roma, 1832; translated into English by Sir George Head, 2 vols, post 8vo, London, 1850; Germ., Augsburg, 1831, 3 vols. †*Wiseman*, Recollections of the Last Four Popes and of Rome in their Times, London and Boston, 1858 (Germ., Schaffhausen, 1858). *J. Crétineau-Joly*, Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi, Paris, 1864; 2nd ed., 1866, 2 vols. (Germ., Paderborn, 1870). Cfr. New Hist. of the Church of J. Christ. *Gams*, Hist. of the Church of Jesus Christ in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 26 sq.

At the death of Pius VI., Rome was still occupied by the French. Thirty-five cardinals, hastening from their several places of exile, assembled in *Venice*, and opened the conclave in the monastery of St. George the Greater, on December 1, 1799.

On the exclusion by Austria of the learned Cardinal *Gerdil*, a native of Savoy, then a part of France,[1] the cardinals, on March 14, 1800, gave their suffrages for *Gregory Barnabas*, of the family of *Chiaramonti*, the large-minded and charitable Cardinal-bishop of Imola, who took the name of *Pius VII.* His election marked the opening of a new era of triumph for the Catholic Church, and falsified the prophecies of the Parisian Clubbists, who confidently predicted that after the death of Pius VI. no Pope would ever again sit in the throne of St. Peter.

Pius VII. was crowned without the usual splendour of ceremonial, March 21, the feast of St. Benedict, whose habit he had worn. The monastery was for the time converted into the Quirinal, and the Church of St. George into the Vatican.

Francis II., Emperor of Germany, in whose dominions the Pope now found an asylum, appointed Marquis *Ghislieri*, of Bologna, his minister plenipotentiary at the Papal Court. Pius VII. also received the congratulations and the usual courtesies from the ambassadors of the Courts of Sardinia, Naples, and Spain, the last-named power being represented by the Patriarch of Antioch. Even Paul I., Emperor of Russia, sent a bishop to Venice to assure the Pope that he would respect and protect the interests of Catholics in those provinces which, by the Partition of Poland (1794), had passed under the government of his empire.

The Romans were ardently longing for the day when the Pope's temporal power would be restored to him, and, though still under the dominion of France, sent an embassy to carry to Pius VII. the expressions of their respect to his person, and the assurances of their submission to his authority. Owing chiefly to some successes of the

[1] See American Cyclopædia, Vol. VII., p. 735, art. *Gerdil*. (Tr.)

allied armies, and partly also to a desire on the part of Napoleon to restore religion in France, the Pope re-entered Rome shortly after (July 3), amid the unbounded enthusiasm of the inhabitants, his first act being to pay a visit to the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's Church. The Pope's first efforts were directed towards repairing the damage the Revolution had wrought both among his people and in the Church, and his plans for effecting these two objects were fully set forth in an *encyclical*, issued some time later. The papal authority was re-established in Acona and Perugia; the tax on corn was abolished; and *Consalvi* was appointed Pro-secretary of State. The public debt had increased to 50,000,000 of francs, and to help to pay it the Pope reduced the revenues of the Papal Palace from 150,000 to 36,000 scudi. He also published edicts for the restoration of morals, and proclaimed a political amnesty, from which only the ringleaders in the late revolutionary troubles were excluded. But events soon took place which rendered some modifications in the administration of the Pontifical government necessary.[1]

By the victory of Marengo, June 14, 1800, the whole of Northern Italy passed under the dominion of the French, and after some more reverses the Austrians were forced to accept the conditions of the *Peace of Lunéville*, February 9, 1801, by which the Adige was declared the boundary of the Austrian States in Italy, the Cisalpine Republic recognized, and the Pope obliged to cede the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara, Forli, and Ravenna. The Pope now evinced an ardent desire to establish friendly relations between France and the Holy See.

Napoleon, who had been named First Consul, December 15, 1799, was equally anxious for a reconciliation, but was probably actuated more by motives of policy than by love of religion. He was well aware that the hatred of the Jacobins against the Church was not shared by the bulk of the people; and he was also fully convinced that it is impossible to rule over a people destitute of religion, and that to restore order and peace to the *State* it was absolutely necessary to re-establish the Catholic Church. By this act he secured the gratitude of the faithful ministers of religion, who declared "*that blessings would necessarily attend the power that was instrumental in setting up again the overturned Altars of the churches.*" It is also quite possible that he counted upon the glory and prestige with which an act so acceptable to the nation would undoubtedly surround him, as making easy his way to the throne to which he aspired. He therefore sent, through Cardinal *De' Martiniani*, Bishop of Vercelli, a request to the Holy Father to send plenipotentiaries to France, with authority to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs. In compliance with this wish, Pius VII. sent as his envoys to Paris *Spina*, Archbishop of Corinth, and *Caselli*, subsequently General of the Servites

[1] See New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. I., pp. 113-120. Cf., also, Discourse of Pius VII. on the tribulations of the Church, pp. 10-16, and his Encyclica of May 25, *ibid.*, pp. 46-52; also *Consalvi's* Memoirs, p. 416.

who, with *Joseph Bonaparte*, the First Consul's brother, *Cretet*, Councillor of State, and *Abbé Bernier*, all selected by Napoleon, set about adjusting the relations of Church and State in France.[1] M. *Cacault* was sent as minister plenipotentiary to the Papal Court, with orders to treat the Pope with all the respect due to his position.[2] Grave difficulties were at first encountered. The bond of unity had been snapped by the civil constitution of the clergy in 1791, and had not been closed since; all the bishoprics in France had been usurped by the constitutional bishops, even during the lifetime of the lawful incumbents; and canonical investiture, as well as the property of the clergy, were in the hands of laymen. Notwithstanding that the plenipotentiaries on both sides had the very best of intentions, and had actually agreed on a great many points, they were not successful in drawing up a concordat wholly satisfactory to the powers they represented. The Pope, who had in the meantime assembled a congregation *a latere* for the special purpose of dealing with the questions involved in the concordat, now sent to Paris Cardinal *Consalvi*, one of its leading members, with full authority to make any concessions which he might judge to be for the good of religion, and compatible with the rights of the Holy See. When Consalvi arrived at Paris, June 22, 1801, he was surprised to learn that the First Consul had that very day assembled the constitutional bishops and parish priests in synod, an event which it was clear would greatly complicate the difficulties of his mission. The synod was opened June 29, 1801, by *Grégoire*, its president, whose propositions were so extravagant that Napoleon, displeased with them, concluded a concordat of seventeen articles with Consalvi, July 15, regulating ecclesiastical affairs in France, and dissolved the so-called national synod.[3] The important question, and the one most difficult of settlement, concerning the lawfulness of the titles by which the bishops held their sees, was summarily disposed of by an exercise of the plenitude of papal authority. The Pope regretted being obliged to resort to so extreme a measure, but felt that the extraordinary and abnormal circumstances of the Church in France, and the necessity of prompt and energetic action to prevent schism and avert persecution, alike rendered his course imperative. By the bull *Qui Christi Domini* he called upon the old bishops holding sees in France by lawful title, but now dispersed, and living in exile in the various countries of Europe, to resign, and of the eighty still surviving, fourty-four at once sent in their resignations, besides fourteen, whose sees were situated in territory

[1] Concerning what follows, cf. *ibid.*, Vol. I., pp. 127-140. The Latin text of the Concordat is found in *Robiano*, Vol. II., pp. 459-469. The Bulla novæ circumscriptionis diœcesium, *ibid.*, pp. 469-477, and pp. 478, 479. Information on the circumscription of the new dioceses is likewise found in *Mazas*, Vol. II., p. 273 sq.

[2] When taking leave of Napoleon, Cacault asked him how he should treat the Pope. "Treat him," replied Napoleon, "as if he were the master of 200,000 men; and bear in mind that I aspire to the honour of being, not the destroyer, but the saviour of the Holy See." *Thiers*, Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire.

[3] *Gams*, Hist. of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 130-141.

recently annexed to France; but the thirty-six others refused. The fifty-nine constitutional bishops were also requested by both the Pope and the Government to surrender their authority and rights into the hands of the Consuls, which they had no alternative but to do. The following are the most important provisions of the *concordat:*[1] The Roman Catholic religion, being that of *the vast majority* of Frenchmen, shall be freely practised throughout all France, subject to no restriction except the police regulations intended to preserve order and public peace. The Holy See, acting in concert with the Government, shall define the boundaries of the new dioceses. The Pope will inform the lawful bishops of the old dioceses that in the interests of peace and unity he confidently hopes they will resign their sees; should they refuse, he will take no notice of their action, but proceed to fill the newly-created sees with incumbents. The First Consul shall make all *nominations* to archbishoprics and bishoprics, and the Holy See confer canonical institution. Before entering upon the functions of their offices, bishops shall take the oath of allegiance, according to the ordinary form, by placing their hands between those of the First Consul; and ecclesiastics of the second rank shall take the same oath in the same way, in presence of officers appointed by the Government to receive it. Bishops shall establish the boundaries of parishes within their respective dioceses, subject, however to the authorization of Government. The bishops shall have the right of appointing pastors, but shall select no one obnoxious to the Government. The Pope, on his part, promises that neither he nor his successors will in any way disturb those in possession of the ecclesiastical estates seized and sold as national property during the Revolution; and, on his part, the First Consul, in the name of the Government, pledges himself to make adequate provision for bishops and priests, and to sanction any new foundations persons may be disposed to make in behalf of the Church. The Pope recognizes and respects in the First Consul all the rights and prerogatives enjoyed by those at the head of the old Government.

When the provisions of the concordat became known at Rome the cardinals disagreed, some favouring and some opposing their acceptance; but Pius VII., after weighing the reasons brought forward by the advocates of both parties, made up his mind to ratify it, and drew out his reasons for doing so in a brief, dated August 13; and, in a second one, dated two days later, he earnestly besought those French bishops who still declined to resign to come generously forward and make the sacrifice in the interest of religion and for the welfare of the Church. He then commissioned Cardinal *Caprara*, Archbishop of Bologna, to go to Paris, and invested him with full power to carry out every provision of the concordat. Although the concordat met

[1] Given in the French original text by *Walter*. Fontes jur. canon., p. 187-190; in Latin, by *Robiano*, Vol. II., p. 459; in German, by *Gams*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 114 sq. For a list of the new sees, together with the determination of their limits, see *Mazas*, Vol. II., p. 273 sq. Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Vol. I., p. 142-153, and p. 175-190.

with no little opposition in France, it was accepted by the First Consul,[1] who, however, published simultaneously with it a code of "*Organic Laws*," with, it was supposed, a view of rendering the acceptance of the concordat less objectionable to the *Corps législatif*, by which it was ratified, April 5, 1802. These *Laws* are in substance as follows:[2]

"No bull, brief, rescript, or mandate; no provision or enactment of any kind whatever coming from the Holy See, even should these refer only to individual and single cases, shall be received, or published, or printed, or carried into effect without leave from the Government. Bishops shall be amenable for misdemeanours to the Council of State, which, if a case be made out against the arraigned, shall be competent to pass a vote of censure (*déclaration d'abus*). Professors in seminaries shall teach the Four Articles of the Declaration of the French Clergy; and bishops shall inform the Minister of Public Worship of their various engagements. No synod may be held in France without leave of Government. Priests having charge of *parochial chapels* shall be removable without canonical process. On the death of a bishop, his see shall be administered by his metropolitan, or, he failing, by the senior bishop of the province. Vicars-general shall continue to exercise the functions of their office after the death of the bishop and until his successor has been inducted. Parish priests shall give the marriage blessing only to those who can prove that the marriage ceremony has been already performed before a civil magistrate.[3] The parish registers shall be valid evidence as to the reception of the Sacraments, but shall not be received as proof of what is purely a civil matter."

These enactments sufficiently show that the First Consul either would not or dared not adopt so liberal a policy towards the Church as had been anticipated.

The Pope protested, but in vain, that these Laws had not been submitted to him. The concordat was, however, executed all the same, and its promulgation was celebrated in the Church of France by a solemn Feast, April 18, 1802. The Democrats and Napoleon's companions-in-arms sneered at this ceremony, which, they said, was the latest comedy, and boasted that the French flag had never been more glorious than since the day it had ceased to be blessed. Napoleon asked General *Delmas* how the celebration pleased him, and the latter is reported to have said "that it was a pretty capuchinade, and to complete it required only the presence of the two millions of men who had been sacrificed in pulling down what the First Consul was now engaged in building up." Still the purpose of Napoleon was unshaken, and that he was fully satisfied with what he had done is shown by his words, uttered at St. Helena, when he had no longer any motive to disguise his real thoughts. "I have never regretted signing the concordat," said he. "I had to have one of some kind, either that one or another. And had there existed no Pope, it would have been necessary to create one." The religious reaction setting in was everywhere visible. Its influence was marked on most of the

[1] *Gams*, Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 124 sq.

[2] For the French original text, see *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 190-198; see also *Gams*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 156 sq.; Vol. II., p. 25 sq. For elucidations, see *Archives* of Canon Law, year 1872, nro. 6.

[3] Cf. *Friedberg*, Hist. of Civil Marriage, Berlin, 1871.

[4] Cardinal Caprara was very active in this matter. Concerning his appointment to the post of Legate *a latere*, and the documents investing him with authority to establish new bishoprics and to grant indulgences in the same manner as they are granted on occasion of jubilees. f. *Robiano*, Vol. II., pp. 487-492. *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 155-161.

literature of the day. It first manifested itself in the works of *Saint-Martin* († 1804), who, because the reveries of Jacob Boehm, Swedenborg, and Pordage had a greater fascination for his mind than the teachings of the Church, did not exert the influence that should be looked for from one of his high moral character and unusual intel lectual gifts. He wove into grotesque and fantastical forms the mystical ideas of nature contained in the works of Boehm and others, thus piecing out a sort of mystico-theosophic system, which he propagated chiefly among the Freemasons of the higher degrees.[1] *Martin Ducrey* did good service in the cause of God by the school which he opened at *Sallanches* (after 1800), and still later by the Carthusian monastery founded by him at Malan. But the one who beyond all others contributed to the restoration of religion and the glorifying of the Christian name at this time was unquestionably *Chateaubriand*, who, with his eloquent pen, touched the hearts of all Frenchmen, and enlisted them in a cause that had long since been set aside and made to give place to the subjects that filled the literature of the day. During the early days of his life he had drifted into scepticism and infidelity; but, moved by the appeal of his dying mother, he returned to the faith of his youth, and, as an evidence of his sincerity, wrote the *Genius of Christianity*. "My religious convictions," he said, writing when advanced in life, "were not always as fixed as they are now. Annoyed at what I regarded as the abuses of some institutions, and indignant at the vices of some men, I fell into sophistical and declamatory habits; but Divine Providence graciously deigned to recall me to a sense of my duty."[2]

The public had been prepared for the promulgation of the concordat by a series of articles in the newspapers. The bulk of the nation, however, had always regarded the impious excesses of the Revolution with horror, and required no such adventitious encouragement to return to the faith of their fathers. It soon ceased to be fashionable among cultivated people to sneer at religion, and to be known as an enthusiastic patron of religious literature gradually came to be regarded as a mark of good breeding. As it had been formerly the *mode* to deride the Church, her teaching and her practices, so it

[1] Des erreurs et de la vérité par un philosophe inconnu, Lyon, 1775; Tableau naturel des rapports qui existent entre Dieu, l'homme et l'univers, Lyon, 1782, showing that we must explain things by man and not man by things; L'Homme de désir, Lyon, 1790; Ecce Homo, Paris, 1792, Lps., 1819; De l'esprit des choses, Paris, 1800, 2 vols.; Œuvres posthumes, Tours, 1807, 2 vols. (Tr.)

[2] "When in her seventy-second year," he goes on to say in his *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe*, "my mother was cast into a frightful prison. In this gloomy abode, whither she had been driven by dire misfortune, she saw several of her children perish about her, and there, too, she ended her own life. In her dying moments she called one of my sisters to her side, bidding her to bring me back to the religion in which I had been brought up. Through my sister I learned the last wish of my mother. After the latter had passed away, my sister also followed, falling a victim to the rigours of her imprisonment. These two voices, speaking to me from out the grave, the death of the one being the interpreter of the death of the other, came with special force upon me. I became a Christian. *Weeping, I believed.*

became now a mark of bad taste to manifest the least disrespect for either her dogma or her worship.

The Christian tone of the language in which *Atala* was written, the stern yet touching scenes of this Christian romance, and the poetic grace and fascinating magic of its style, all powerfully contributed, not alone to widen the narrow limits within which the poetry and language of France had been hitherto confined by severe laws, but also to shake off the feelings of indifference that had so long rested upon a thoughtless yet vivacious and religious people. The publication of the work, in fact, marked the beginning of a literary, moral, and religious revolution in France.[1]

Ecclesiastical seminaries, both greater and lesser, were opened all over the country, but chiefly in the metropolitan and suffragan sees, and conducted strictly according to the instructions laid down in the decrees of Trent. Priests, by the request of Government, resumed their distinctive dress; and the piety of the faithful made generous provision for institutions and communities founded for the education of the young and the care of the sick. Remarkable conversions were of daily occurrence. *Laharpe*, while languishing in prison, read the *Following of Christ* (1794), and was so deeply affected by its profound yet simple truths, that he returned to the faith, and in a codicil to his last will withdrew whatever errors were contained in his works (February 11, 1803). New dignitaries restored in a measure her former lustre to the Church. *Du Belloy*, Archbishop of Paris; *De Boisgelin*, of Tours; *Cambacérès*, of Rouen; and *Fesch*, of Lyons, were created cardinals. The *Jubilee*, which was opened March 10, 1804, also contributed largely towards leading men's minds back to the practices of religion. Still the concordat met with some opposition, and to overcome it the Cardinal Legate addressed a circular letter to the French bishops.

The efforts of Cardinal *Caprara* to restore order and re-establish the authority of the Church throughout France were ably seconded by the indefatigable and pious Abbé *Barruel*. Henceforth certain congregations, among others the *Priests of the Missions*, the *Brothers of Christian Doctrine*, the *Hospitaller Sisters*, and the *Sisters of Charity*, to whose undoubted utility and beneficent ministrations Napoleon himself bore testimony, were recognized by Government and their establishments authorized by law. The *Congregation for Foreign Missions* was under the special protection of the Government,

[1] *Chateaubriand*, Atala, ou les Amours de deux sauvages, Paris (1801). The episode of Atala was incorporated in his *Génie du Christianisme*, ou Beautés de la religion Chrétienne, Paris, 1802, 2 vols. *Les Martyrs*, the most admired of his works, appeared in 1809, 2 vols.; his Itinerare de Paris à Jerusalem, Paris, 1811, 3 vols. Most of his works have been translated into English, German, and other languages. The Genius of Christianity, tr. by *Chas. White*, Baltimore, 1856. Complete Works, best ed., by *Sainte-Beuve*, 12 vols., 1859-1861. Part of a new and complete illustrated edition, to consist of 14 vols., has appeared (Paris, Sarlit) since 1864. See *Villemain*, Chateaubriand, sa vie, ses écrits, son influence sur son temps, etc., which appeared in 1858, in 2 vols.

and received Government aid in carrying out the objects of its foundation.

After peace had been concluded by General *Brune* between the Ottoman Porte and France, the latter country became once more the protector of the churches of the Latin rite in the Levant; and General Sebastian, while travelling through Egypt, Syria, and the Ionian Islands, had frequent occasion to exercise this newly-acquired right, which he did by order of the French Government.

Napoleon having been proclaimed *Emperor* of the French by a "senatus consultum," May 8, 1804, sent many urgent invitations to the Pope to come to Paris to crown him, that thus an empire that had been the reward of victory might receive the consecration of religion.[1] After some hesitation, Pius VII., regardless of the opposition of the other European powers, and of the solemn protest of Louis XVIII., resolved to comply; because, as he said in a Consistory held October 29, by making the journey he would have an opportunity of conversing personally with the emperor, and thus advancing the interests of *religion;* and he took heaven to witness that in doing what he was about to do he had no object in view other than the glory of God, the weal of souls, and the good of the Catholic *religion*.[2]

Accompanied by four cardinals, four archbishops, and two prelates, the Holy Father set out from Rome on the 2nd of November, amidst the tears of his people, and, after crossing the Alps in the depth of winter, began his journey through France, which was one continuous triumph, when, as the Pope said himself, "he moved through a nation on its knees." The ceremony of *coronation* took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame, December 2nd,[3] the emperor taking the crown that had been blessed by the Pope and placing it upon his own head, and afterwards crowning Josephine as empress.

The universal tokens of religious respect and filial love with which the French people had welcomed the Holy Father were not less marked after the ceremony of coronation had taken place. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris gave eloquent expression to the sentiments that filled the minds of all. "In vain," said he, "have the enemies of the Church been multiplied; their very name has passed away into the night of time; scarcely a trace can be found of their existence. . . . O Holy Roman Church! ages have passed over thee, and thou art still triumphant; thou hast ever overcome impiety

[1] Comte *D'Haussonville*, L'église romaine et le premier empire, 1800-1814, 5 vols. Paris, 1872.

[2] From this may be seen how little importance is to be attached to the assertion of the Abbé de Pradt, who said that the Pope, in making this journey, had not the interests of religion in view; that his object, which was wholly political, was to obtain the restitution of the three legations. (Tr.)

[3] By request of the Pope, Napoleon's marriage with Josephine de la Pagerie, the widow of Viscount de Beauharnais, contracted in 1796 according to the civil form, was on this occasion solemnized according to the *essential rite* prescribed by the Council of Trent. At eleven o'clock at night, on the eve of the coronation, a chapel was prepared in the emperor's apartments, and at midnight the emperor and empress received the nuptial blessing from Cardinal Fesch. The witnesses to the marriage ceremony were Portalis and Duroc, the Grand Marshal of the Palace. These circumstances were kept from the public. *Rohrbacher*, Ch. Hist. (Tr.)

by preserving purity of morals, integrity of doctrine, and uniformity of discipline, as these came to thee from thy Divine Founder and his Apostles." The respectful homage joyfully rendered by persons of every rank and condition of life to the Holy Father soon roused the jealousy of the emperor, who showed the annoyance such marks of sympathy caused him in a way at once unworthy of himself and painful to his august host. The Holy Father was compelled against his will to spend the remainder of the winter in Paris, and was not even permitted to make such visits as his pious solicitude suggested.

In the course of the many interviews he had with the emperor, however, he obtained for the bishops the free exercise of their authority, removed the obstacles that until then had stood in the way of young men aspiring to the priesthood; initiated many measures providing for the spiritual welfare of the sick and of the army, and did much good in other ways. But his earnest demands for the restitution of the Legations and the revocation of the *Organic Laws* were to no purpose; the emperor firmly refused to yield. It was only when the emperor passed the Alps to receive the Iron Crown of the Lombards as King of Italy, May 26, 1805, that the Pope, forming, as it were, one of the Imperial retinue, was permitted to return to his States. While on his way home, the Pope was again the object of enthusiastic expressions of public joy, and the fêtes celebrated in his honour at Lyons and Turin in some sort rivalled in magnificence those gotten up for the emperor himself.[1] But the Pope had still holier and sweeter consolations; for, during his stay in Turin, by his personal influence, he persuaded the archbishop to resign his see, the latter thus complying with a request that had been frequently made and as frequently refused. *Scipio Ricci*, promoter of the schismatical Synod of Pistoia, also manifested a sincere disposition to be reconciled to the Church. Arrived at Rome, the Pope again took the administration of affairs into his own hands, and, while giving his best energies to the government of the Universal Church, found time to devote to the encouragement of the arts within his own States.

§ 391. *Disagreement between the Pope and the Emperor.*

Fragmens relatifs à l'histoire eccl. des premières années du XIX. siècle, Paris, 1814. Correspondance authentique de la cour de Rome avec la France depuis l'invasion de l'état Romain jusqu'à l'enlèvement du Souverain Pontife, 1809. *Jaeger*, Biography of Pius VII., Frankfort, 1825. For the works of *Pacca*, *Artaud*, Vol. II., *Wiseman*, see bibliography, heading, § 390. Mémoires du Card. *Consalvi*, Paris, 1864; 2nd ed., 1866, 2 vols., Germ., Paderborn, 1870.

The dislike which the emperor manifested towards the Pope during the stay of the latter in Paris was not a passing feeling: it was deep-seated, and grew more intense and pronounced as time went on.

The emperor had made use of the influence of the Pope to give to his authority the sanction of *religion* in the eyes of the people, and had caused an insertion to be made in a French catechism, recently published, to the effect "that anyone resisting the authority of the emperor, who had been consecrated by the Pope, risked his eternal salvation; and that one of the first duties of a Christian was to do military service for one who had restored the authority of the Church." But he was not yet content. That there should exist in the world an authority which men regarded as superior to his own was a source of annoyance to him; and, as he had bent the sceptres of kings to his imperial will, so he also conceived the design of making the Pope do his pleasure. But to accomplish this it was necessary to begin open hostilities against the Holy See, and pretexts for an outbreak were easily found.

[1] New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. II., pp. 306-313.

Immediately after his coronation at Milan, May 26, 1805, he published several decrees highly prejudicial to the interests of the Church. He appointed a commission, which was charged with the duty of enforcing in Italy the "*Civil Code*" of France, without the least modification, and, in direct contravention of the concordat[1] entered into between the Holy See and the Cisalpine Republic, took upon him to appoint to Italian bishoprics. The Pope declined to confer canonical institution, and here the matter rested until the close of the campaign of 1805. To a request from the emperor to declare null the marriage contracted by his brother *Jerome* with Miss Patterson, in Baltimore, U.S., while still in his non-age, the Pope replied that with his present information he could not comply. The emperor cut the matter short by having the marriage declared void by the civil tribunals, and Jerome was shortly afterwards married to a princess of Würtemberg. "The King of England and the Emperor of Russia," Napoleon was wont to say, "are masters in their own houses. In the religious affairs of their dominions they are absolute and without control." Such was the commencement of a project, the ultimate aim of which was the annihilation of the Holy See. These beginnings were followed up by *the seizure and occupation of the port and city of Ancona;* by the consequent violation of the neutral territory of the Pope, which had thus far been respected by all the belligerent powers, thus exposing the States of the Church to be the theatre on which reprisals would be made against France; by demanding, some time later, the dismissal of such ambassadors from the Papal Court as were personally obnoxious to him; and, finally, by ordering the Pope to expel all English citizens from his States, and to close his harbours against English vessels, threatening, if his wishes were not complied with, to occupy the March of Ancona with imperial troops.[2] "You are sovereign of Rome; I am emperor; my enemies should also be yours." Such is the imperious and novel logic employed by Napoleon, in a letter addressed to the Pope, on the 13th of February, 1806. Repelling a pretension which would involve the Father of Christendom in wars, it mattered not for what purpose or against whom they might be waged, whenever it suited the imperial pleasure to declare them, the Pope replied that he could not consistently with his honour or his conscience enter into an alliance which would draw upon him the enmity of all the emperor's adversaries, and make him a partner to a universal and permanent war; and that he could not begin hostilities against a Government which, like that of England, had done him no wrong. "Far from acceding to such a demand," added the Pope, "a minister of peace, representing the God of peace, should call unceasingly upon heaven to put an end to war and to restore universal peace and concord." Wounded by the tone of the Pope's reply, the emperor rejoined, as if the Holy See were then what it had been in the Middle Ages, that Pius VII. held such language towards him as a Gregory VII. might, and that, owing to his own great forbearance, so out of keeping with his true character, and so contrary to his usual policy, the belief had undoubtedly gained ground at Rome that the thunders of the Vatican had terrors for him.

The Pope, however, was not frightened by these threats. Napoleon believing that Pius VII. was under the control of Consalvi, styled the "*Syren of Rome*," demanded the resignation of the latter, and he was accordingly replaced by Cardinal Casoni, then seventy-four years of age. After the seizure of the Principalities of Ponte-Corvo and Benevento, and their incorporation into the kingdom of Naples, the former was given as an imperial fief to the Protestant General Bernadotte, and the latter to Talleyrand, then French minister for foreign affairs, and formerly Bishop of Autun.

Indignant at so flagrant an outrage, the Papal Government ceased to transact any further business through Cardinal Caprara, the Legate at Paris, conducting all affairs of State with France directly from Rome. In answer to the emperor's insolent letter, just referred to, the Pope sent word that he must decline to unconditionally acknowledge Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples. "Your Majesty," he wrote to the emperor, "is conscious of power; but We know that there is a God above all the monarchs of the earth, who is the avenger of justice and innocence, and to whom every human authority is subject." Napoleon replied, in a note of January 7, 1808, by making six new demands, which were equivalent to a declaration of war.[3] Shortly after (February 2, 1808) General *Miollis* entered Rome at the head of a French army, and on the same night the Pope drew up a protest in his own name and that of his successors against the occupation of his territory, and directed that a copy be sent to each of the foreign ambassadors

---

[1] New Hist., &c., Book II., p. 261 sq.
[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. II., pp. 339-347, where the Pope's answer is given.
[3] *Ibid.*, Bk. II., p. 397 sq.

then in the city. This provoked fresh outrages. The papal troops were incorporated with the French army, and such officers as resisted were sent to Mantua. Four cardinals were carried away to Naples as State criminals; ten more were led back under military escort to the various countries from which they had come; the Swiss Guard was disarmed in front of the papal palace, and the Noble Guard shut up in the Castle of Sant' Angelo. To the renewed protests of the Pope's Secretary of State the French ambassador replied, "that these were only the consequences of refusing to comply with the wishes of the emperor, who is determined to unite all Italy into a league, offensive and defensive, and thus banish war and disorder from the peninsula." "By this refusal," he continued, "the Holy Father, while protesting that he does not want war with the emperor, declares it against him. Now, war leads directly to conquest, and conquest to a change of government in the conquered states. This, however, would not deprive the Pope of his spiritual rights; he would still continue Bishop of Rome, as his predecessors were during the first eight centuries and under Charlemagne. It is a source of grief to the emperor to see the products of genius, statesmanship, and civilization going to ruin, because of an unreasonable obstinacy and blindness." The Pope replied in a note of April 19, in which he said that since the emperor was deaf to the voice of justice, there was no way of preventing him from taking possession of the States of the Church by conquest; but, at the same time, he felt called upon to solemnly protest that, being at peace with the whole world, there was no justification for the act, and that it must be characterized as a violent and unprecedented usurpation. While these negotiations were going forward, the decrees of Napoleon were being carried out, declaring the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino irrevocably incorporated with the kingdom of Italy, and ordering all cardinals, prelates, and servants of the Court of Rome to return to the kingdom of Italy before the 25th of May, under penalty of confiscation of all their goods.[1] The real purpose of the last clause was the dissolution of the College of Cardinals, twenty-four of whom had been already sent into exile. The Pope again protested, but in vain, the emperor relaxing nothing of his violence. *Cavalchini*, the Governor of Rome, who, it seems, was not properly submissive to the emperor, was arrested and sent away to the fortress of *Fenestrelle;* Cardinal *Gabrielli*, Secretary of State, was surprised in the Government office, and, after witnessing the breaking open of his desks and the seizure of his papers, was himself conducted to his episcopal see of *Sinigaglia;* and, some time later, Cardinal *Pacca*, who had been appointed pro-Secretary by the Pope, was also placed under arrest. Hearing of the arrest of his minister, the Pope at once sought him out, and going with him to the Quirinal palace, expressed his determination to share his captivity. The palace was forthwith surrounded by a military guard, and everyone going in or coming out was strictly searched. A military court was set up to try and condemn such of the Pope's subjects as showed any reluctance to render obedience to the French authorities. Finally, on the 17th of May, 1809, the famous Vienna decree was published, annexing the remnant of the States of the Church to the French Empire,[2] and enacting that the Pope should receive a yearly revenue of two millions of francs, and retain his palaces and personal property, and declaring *Rome a free city of the Empire.* The decree was carried into execution on the following 10th of June, and the Pope at once caused a protest to be drawn up in the Italian language, which he signed, and had posted through the city on the night of the following day. With unbending dignity and steady adherence to duty he instructed Cardinal Pacca to take the necessary steps towards publishing a *bull of excommunication*, recommending, however, that the utmost prudence be used in carrying it into effect. In a few hours the celebrated bull *Quum memoranda illa die* was struck off, and on the following morning was found affixed to the doors of the three principal churches of Rome.[3] *Major excommunication and anathema* were pronounced against all the perpetrators, abettors, and advisers of the invasion of the rights and the territory of the Holy See; but at the same time the subjects of the Pope and all Christian peoples were forbidden to make this sentence a ground or pretext for invading either the rights or the property of those affected by it. Napoleon, while feigning to make a jest of the sentence of excommunication,[4] forbade the publication of the bull, which was received

---

[1] New Hist., &c., Bk. III., p. 436 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. III., p. 482 sq.

[3] *Ibid.*, Bk. III., p. 488. Also *Pacca's* Memoirs of His Holiness Pius VII., Bk. I. pp. 78 and 114 sq., where the text of the bull is given.

[4] In a letter to Eugene Beauharnais, Viceroy of Italy, he said: "Does he not know that the times are greatly changed? Does he mistake me for Louis the Mild? or does he think that his excommunications will cause the arms to drop from the hands of my soldiers?" (Mr. *A. Alison*, in his Hist. of Europe, quotes this passage, adding that Napoleon's words were literally fulfilled in the Russian campaign. (Tr.)

by all Christendom with expressions of undisguised satisfaction, and had an article inserted in the *Moniteur*, containing an exposition of the principles set forth in the Declaration of the Gallican clergy, denying the right of the Pope to pass sentence of excommunication upon any sovereign, and least of all upon the sovereign of France.[1] Pius VII., quietly but firmly refusing to abdicate his temporal sovereignty, was hurried away to Florence, thence to Turin, and from there to Grenoble, where orders were received to conduct him back through Dauphiné and Provence to *Savona*, where he arrived, worn out with the fatigue of a long journey on horseback through Piedmont.[2] At Valence Pius had the consolation of being able to bless the tomb of his predecessor. In the meantime Cardinal Pacca had been separated from the Pope and led away to the stronghold of Fenestrelle, situated on one of the highest spurs of the Alps, between Piedmont an Dauphiné.[3]

At Savona the Holy Father was strictly guarded in the hôtel of the prefecture, not being allowed to hold audience with anyone except in the presence of his guard. He steadily refused to accept his monthly allowance of a hundred thousand francs, declined to avail himself of the comforts and conveniences that had been provided for him, and set aside the pomp and circumstance with which it was intended to surround him, disdaining to be the recipient of any favour from the hand of a sacrilegious spoiler, and preferring to receive his support from the generosity and charity of the faithful. He repulsed with the same quiet energy and unbending dignity the frequently renewed demand to surrender his title to the Government of Rome, and to go and reside as a pensioner of the French Government at Paris, with an annuity of two million of francs.[4]

On the day of the Pope's abduction, July 6, 1809, Napoleon gained the victory of Wagram, which secured to him the Peace of Vienna, October 13, 1809, and the hand of the archduchess, *Maria Louisa*. Now at the zenith of his power, he turned this coincidence to the best account, and, in a circular letter, addressed to all the bishops of France, ordered them to commemorate by a religious solemnity the day on which God seemed to have given a divine sanction to his attitude towards the Pope by giving so brilliant a victory to his arms. In justification of the measures adopted in relation to the Pope, he reminded the bishops that Christ, although of the royal house of David, had no desire to be an earthly prince; quite the contrary, for He instructed his followers to render obedience to Cæsar and to Cæsar's laws. In order to be able the better to influence the College of Cardinals as to the selection of a successor to Pius VII., in the event of his death, Napoleon, in December, 1809, ordered all the cardinals still residing in Rome to repair to Paris. He also had the archives of the various departments of ecclesiastical administration transported thither, thus suspending the regular labours of the various Congregations for an interval of five years.

Returning to Paris flushed with the victories of his Austrian campaign, Napoleon took the resolution of thrusting aside his lawful wife and contracting a second marriage, in the hope of leaving a lineal heir to the throne.[5] A decree of divorce was granted by a *senatûs consultum*, December 15, 1809, and was subsequently ratified by Cardinal Fesch, the emperor's nephew, as Metropolitan of Paris, Archbishop of Lyons, and Primate of Gaul,

---

[1] See p. 17.

[2] Relation exacte et détaillée de l'enlèvement du Pape Pie VII. par Radet. Cf. New Hist., &c., p. 449; also *Pacca*, p. 93 sq.

[3] *Pacca*, Vol. II., pp. 18-120. New Hist., &c., Bk. III., p. 505 sq.

[4] Napoleon himself avowed that one of his favourite projects had been to take from the Pope his temporal power and to transfer him to Paris. Even when at St. Helena, he said: "The establishment of the Court of Rome at Paris would have been attended with important political results. The influence of the Pope over Spain, Italy, the Rhenish Confederation, and Poland would have strengthened the federative bonds of the Great Empire. The influence of the Head of Christendom over the Catholics of England, Ireland, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia, would have become the heritage of France." It is evident from these words why Napoleon came to an open rupture with the Pope.

[5] On the dissolution of Napoleon's marriage with Josephine, cf. *The Catholic*, of Mentz, Vol. 55, p. 58 sq., where the alleged cause is said to have been the non-observance of the formalities prescribed by the Council of Trent. See also *Kutschker*, Laws on Matrimony (Vol. IV., § 371), accompanied by the report of the *Abbé Rudemare*, then syndic of the ecclesiastical administration of Paris. Also Archives of Canon Law, by *Moy* and *Vehring*. Vol. III., p. 718; and particularly *Helfert* (Austrian Under-Secretary of State), Maria Louisa, Vienna, 1873.

acting on the pretext that access to the Holy Father was impracticable, if not impossible. Napoleon then demanded and received the hand of Maria Louisa of Austria, a daughter of the proud race of Hapsburg. The marriage was celebrated by proxy, March 11, 1810, and solemnly by Cardinal Fesch in the chapel of the Tuileries, April 2nd of the same year. Thirteen of the cardinals refused to be present at the ceremony, and Napoleon in consequence ordered them in future to wear black instead of red, which gave rise to the well-known distinction between the *red cardinals* and the *black*. Some time later he banished the black cardinals to various provincial towns, and discontinued the payment of their revenues. It was about this time that Napoleon found the letter of Louis XIV. revoking the edict relative to the Declaration of the Gallican clergy of 1682, which he pitched into the fire, with the remark, "These ashes will not give us much uneasiness hereafter."[1] Pius VII. showed himself quite as firm when a prisoner and in exile as when free and upon his throne; and now, as then, refused to confer canonical institution upon the bishops appointed by the emperor, alleging that he did not wish to act without the advice of his cardinals, from which he was precluded by his captivity. To meet the difficulty and escape the danger which a persistent refusal might bring with it, it was suggested to the Pope to confer canonical institution without mentioning either the fact that the bishops had been appointed by the emperor or that he himself acted of his free-will. This novel expedient and unworthy subterfuge was spurned by the Pope (August 26, 1809), as was also the proposition to commit the administration of dioceses to Vicars-Capitular, as had been done in Paris and Florence. The emperor, transported with fury, determined to make the Pope feel the full weight of his anger. His books, papers, and even his writing materials were taken from him, and he received an intimation from the Prefect of *Montenotte* that any attempt to communicate with any church would subject both himself and the person addressed to the penalties of high treason and the church to confiscation. Not in the least intimidated, Pius VII. replied: "I shall lay these threats at the foot of the crucifix, and give my cause, which is his also, into the keeping of God."

Fully conscious that his own dignity and the peace of his States required the immediate settlement of ecclesiastical affairs, which had been thrown into such disorder by his own violent acts, Napoleon appointed an Ecclesiastical Commission at Paris, November 16, 1810, to which he proposed the following questions:—

I. To whom should application be made for necessary dispensations when communication between the Pope and the subjects of the emperor is entirely broken off?

II. Which is the best legal expedient for procuring the canonical institution of bishops appointed by the emperor, when the Pope refuses to issue the necessary bulls?

The Commissioners, instead of pointing out to the emperor that the only effectual way of putting an end to the disorders, growing out of the existing condition of things, lay in a restoration of the Pope to freedom and the enjoyment of his rights, drew a distinction between the general and the special laws of the Church. From the former, they said, there was no dispensation possible; from the latter, the bishops were competent to dispense, and to them the faithful might apply.

In reply to the second question, the Commissioners censured the conduct of the Pope, and recommended that a clause be added to the Concordat of 1801, binding the Holy See to confer canonical institution within a specified and limited time; and, in case of refusal, proposed that a National Synod be called, but not until after a deputation had waited upon the Pope and laid the true state of affairs before him.

The emperor, having assembled the cardinals and bishops composing the Commission, the counsellors of State, and the officers of the Crown, proceeded to make a violent harangue against the Pope. Of all those present, only the Abbé *Emery* had the manliness to tell the emperor plainly that the council which he was about to convoke would have no authority whatever if it were not in unity with the Head of the Church and sanctioned by him. The emperor, strange to say, did not seem offended by this outspoken frankness. He, nevertheless, issued a circular letter, written in that imperative tone and laconic style which he was wont to use towards his soldiers, and addressed to the French and Italian bishops, convoking a *National Council*, to meet at Paris, April 25, 1811. There were altogether ninety-five French and Italian prelates, of whom six were cardinals, nine archbishops, and eighty bishops. At the same time a deputation of bishops was sent to wait upon the Pope at Savona, to inform him that the emperor desired to renew the concordat of 1801, but on condition that the Holy See would confer canonical institution

---

[1] *De Pradt*, Histoire des quatre concordats, T. II., c. 31. *Pacca*, Vol. II., p. 10 sq.

upon the bishops already appointed, and consent to the insertion of a clause to the following effect: "If the Pope shall not have issued the bull conferring canonical institution at the expiration of three months, the metropolitan may grant it to his suffragans, and reciprocally they to him." The Pope was further informed that upon these conditions he might return to Rome, after having taken the oath of obedience and allegiance to the emperor, prescribed for bishops by the concordat; that should he refuse these overtures he might reside at Avignon with an annuity of two millions of francs, where he would be treated as a sovereign, have the ambassadors of all Christian powers at his court, and exercise his spiritual jurisdiction without restraint; but that he would not be permitted to take any steps hostile to the Four Articles of the Gallican Declaration. After the bishops had drawn a frightful picture of the evils that would follow his refusal, the Pope at length consented to confer canonical institution upon those appointed to bishoprics by Napoleon; to extend the concordat of 1801 to the churches of Tuscany, Parma, and Piacenza; and to accept the proposed clause, adding, however, that the term should be extended to six months—a condition which was agreed to by the Deputation, provided "that investiture was withheld for no reason other than the personal unworthiness of the candidate." Taking advantage of this momentary weakness, the bishops drew up four articles embodying the promises of the Pope, which the latter witnessed and agreed to, but declined to sign,[1] on the ground that the articles were neither a treaty nor a protocol, but simply an earnest of his desire to come to an understanding, which might lead to peace and harmony.

On the 17th of June of the same year the Council was opened at Paris by Cardinal Fesch with the customary ceremonies.[2] *Mgr. de Boulogne*, Bishop of Troyes, delivered a discourse on the importance of the Holy See and the influence of the Catholic religion on social order and the prosperity of nations. After the Mass of the Holy Ghost had been said, the symbol of Trent was read and the oath of *fidelity to the Pope* administered. Napoleon's message to the Council was singularly out of keeping with the oath. The debate on the address and the emperor's message was spirited, lengthy, and marked by a wide divergence of opinion, which threatened to become serious. Some of the prelates demanded that, *before taking up any other business*, the emperor be requested to set the Pope at liberty. The motion was drawn up and put before the Council by *Gaspar Maximilian, Baron of Droste-Vischering, suffragan Bishop of Münster*,[3] and seconded by *Irenaeus de Solly*, Bishop of Chambéry, and by the Archbishop of Turin. It was opposed by the court-prelates on the ground that it would give offence to the emperor. A lively opposition was made to these latter in the session of the 27th of June, when they proposed that in the address to the emperor mention should be made of the Gallican Articles and canonical institution. The two sections having failed to agree, the address was signed by only the president and the secretary. A committee was appointed to carry the address to the emperor on the 30th of June, but Napoleon was so incensed that he declined either to receive the committee or accept their address. After these preliminary skirmishes the council took up the discussion of the question for which it was called together, and began to cast about for some means of dispensing with papal bulls in conferring canonical investiture on bishops. The preparatory committee, in a meeting at Cardinal Fesch's lodgings, at once decided by a majority of votes, that the council could provide no substitute for pontifical bulls except provisionally, and then only in urgent cases. In the session of July 10th the committee reported, giving the reasons for its decision. The bishops in the interest of the emperor held and defended the contrary opinion, and in support of it appealed to the concessions made by the Pope at Savona; but being in the minority, they were powerless, and their arguments were weakened by the fact that the promises wrung from the Pope were not authenticated by his signature. The council was just preparing to solemnly avow its incompetency to deal with the question in hand, when its president suddenly prorogued its sessions; and Napoleon, learning what had taken place, signed a decree dissolving it altogether, July 18, 1811. Mgr. *De Boulogne*, Bishop of Troyes; Mgr. *Hirn*, Bishop of Tournay; Mgr. *De Broglie*, Bishop of Ghent, who as

---

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 42 sq. New Hist., &c., Bk. III., p. 542 sq.

[2] †*Melchers*, The National Council of Paris in 1811, accompanied by authentic documents, Münster, 1814. *Robiano*, T. III., p. 172 sq. *Thiers*, Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, Vol. XIII., on which there is an elegant criticism in the *Correspondant*, livraison du 23 Juin, 1856.

[3] See *Gaspar Maximilian's* own declaration (in "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. XV., pp. 325-355). *Lyonnet*, Le Cardinal Fesch, &c., Lyon, 1841.

members of the committee, had made themselves conspicuous by arguing against the competency of the council, were arrested and imprisoned in the dungeons of Vincennes.

Seeing his projects frustrated, Napoleon cried out, while the first impulse of anger was still upon him: "I have been passing over an abyss unawares. That concordat is the biggest blunder of my life." Before again convoking the council he determined to make sure of his men, and accordingly *Bigot de Préameneu* and *Bovara*, the ministers of worship for France and Italy, called personally upon each of the Bishops of these two countries then in Paris, and by promises and flatteries, by threats and reproaches, endeavoured to gain them over to the interests of the emperor. They were in a measure successful, having obtained the written promises of many of them and the conditional promises of others to support a contemplated decree; fourteen courageously refusing to sign the document at all. Having received the pledges of these prelates, the emperor again ordered the bishops to assemble in general session, August 5th, when, on motion of M. Barral, a decree was passed, based upon the Savona concessions. A deputation of five cardinals and nine bishops, all of whom had given pledges before leaving Paris to support the designs of the Government,[1] waited upon the Pope at Savona, and finally, on September 20th, obtained his signature to a brief drawn up by Cardinal *Roverella*, one of the deputies approving the decree of the Council, on condition, however, that the metropolitan, in conferring canonical investiture, should state in every case that he did so *in the name of the Holy See*, to which all the documents properly authenticated should be sent. At the same time bulls were obtained conferring canonical institution upon a number of bishops. These transactions were telegraphed to Paris in a spirit of triumphant exultation, in which, however, Napoleon did not share. He sent back the brief, and refused to make any use of the bulls conferring investiture, very much to the disgust of the Abbé *de Pradt*, who, in drawing them up, had not forgotten his own archbishopric of Malines. Four of the bishops belonging to the Deputation having gone to Turin, received orders to return to Savona, and prevail upon the Pope to give a full consent to all the wishes of the emperor. This the Pope firmly and steadfastly refused to do, and his resolution was not in the least shaken by the declaration of the Prefect of Montenotte, who, speaking in the name of the emperor, said that since the brief of the 20th of September had not received the imperial sanction, Napoleon regarded the concordat as revoked, and that in the future no papal interference in canonical investiture would be tolerated. The bishops assembled at Paris were now unceremoniously dismissed (October 20) by the Minister of Worship, and thus the Council that had been opened with such pomp and splendour was closed without a religious solemnity of any kind.

After several months of anxious suspense, during which Napoleon was getting ready to set out on his Russian campaign, which was opened May 9, 1812, Pius VII. was summoned June 9, 1812, to make preparations for a journey to France. He was instructed to lay aside every mark and token of his pontifical office, and to travel in the strictest incognito. After a very fatiguing journey, made for the most part during the heated hours of the day, the cortege arrived at the Convent of the Cistercians, on Mount Cenis, where the holy old man grew so ill that the officers, fearing to proceed, despatched couriers to Turin to ask for fresh instructions. Word came back ordering them to do as they had been bidden, and on the 14th of June the Pope, who had that very morning received the last Sacraments, was once more hurried on his journey, travelling even during the night, and, without making a single halt, finally arrived at *Fontainebleau*, June 20th, where he fell so ill that his life was despaired of,[2] being unable to leave his bed for many months. The *red cardinals* and some bishops high in the imperial favour, who alone were permitted to see him, attempted to frighten him by drawing highly-coloured pictures of the distressing condition of the Church, the dangers of an interminable schism, and the secret plots which the philosophical sects were actively prosecuting. Finding that such representations were ineffectual to move him, they appealed to his pity, begging him to call to mind the rigorous captivity in which many cardinals and bishops were now languishing. Their efforts were unavailing, and in the meantime Napoleon having returned from his disastrous Russian campaign, and dreading a revolution of feeling among Frenchmen still sincerely devoted to the Catholic Church, hastened, with either real or simulated sincerity, to be again reconciled to the Pope. On New Year's Day, 1813, he sent one of his chamberlains to carry his good wishes to Pius VII., who returned the compliment through Cardinal *Doria*, during whose visit at Paris it was agreed that negotiations should again

---

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 52 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 60 sq.

be opened between the Pope and the emperor. When those charged with conducting them perceived that the Holy Father was broken in spirit and disposed to yield, they were desirous that the emperor should have all the glory of again establishing friendly relations between France and the Holy See. Accordingly the emperor, accompanied by the empress, made his appearance very unexpectedly at Fontainebleau, where he spent five days in conference with Pius VII. All the arts of persuasion were used to bring the Pope to terms. The emperor was by turns gentle and carressing, severe and cold, imperious and threatening. At one time he so far lost control of his temper, and so far forgot the respect due to the Head of the Church, as to reproach him "*with being ill-informed in ecclesiastical matters.*"[1]

These negotiations were finally brought to a close on the 25th of January, when eleven *articles preliminary* to a new concordat were signed. By these unfortunate articles the Pope pledged himself to confer canonical institution upon bishops appointed by the emperor within six months, at the expiration of which time it might be conferred by the metropolitan, or, he failing, by the senior suffragan of the province. In return the Pope was permitted to appoint to ten sees in either France or Italy, and also to the six suburbicarian bishoprics, which, it was provided, were to be re-established; the endowments not already disposed of were to be restored, and such as had been sold repurchased; the domains of the Holy See not as yet alienated were to be administered by the Pope's mandatary, and an annuity of two millions of francs granted as an indemnification for those that had been alienated; the number of bishoprics in Tuscany and the territory of Genoa was to be reduced, and new ones established in Holland and the Hanseatic Departments; and, finally, all persons, whether cardinals, bishops, or laymen, who had in the course of the late events incurred the emperor's displeasure were to be rehabilitated.

By signing these articles, had he done so unconditionally, Pius VII. would have virtually renounced his right of sovereignty within the States of the Church. This, however, he did not do; for he explicitly stipulated that they should not be promulgated until after they had been singly discussed in a secret Consistory, as the laws of the Church require. But Napoleon, instead of waiting the result of such discussion, styled these articles, which were understood as being only preliminary measures, the *Concordat of Fontainebleau*, and at once gave orders that they should be promulgated throughout the whole empire, and that the *Te Deum* should be chanted in all the churches.

Immediately after the departure of the emperor, the Pope lapsed into a state of profound melancholy. To Cardinal *di Pietro*, who was the first of the cardinals to obtain his freedom, the Pope spoke out his mind. The cardinal drew his attention to the fact that a concordat concluded upon such a basis might bring disastrous consequences upon the Church. Cardinal *Pacca* and several other members of the Sacred College, who arrived soon after, were of the same opinion, and resolved to request the Pope to address a letter to the emperor, revoking the Preliminary Articles, and declaring them null and void.

When Cardinal *Consalvi* informed the Holy Father of the action of the cardinals, he freely admitted that he had been led to consent to what he now clearly saw was wholly impracticable, and accordingly approved the plan of proceeding advised by the Sacred College. To sit down and sketch the rough draft of this ever memorable letter, and to write it out with his own hand and address it to the emperor, must have cost Pius VII. a painful struggle.[2] He *had it read before the Sacred College*, and as the reading was going on made such reflections on its contents as it was not thought prudent to set down in writing. A copy of the letter was given to each of the cardinals.

Learning that the Pope, since his interview with Cardinal *di Pietro*, had determined to revoke the Preliminary Articles, Napoleon at once promulgated the concordat as a law of the empire; and, immediately upon receipt of the Holy Father's letter, published a decree threatening severe penalties against all persons infringing the concordat, and making it obligatory upon all archbishops, bishops, and chapters within his dominions. On the 13th of April, Cardinal di Pietro was placed under arrest, stripped of the insignia of his dignity, and carried away a prisoner to Auxonne. Cardinals Pacca and Consalvi were charged to say to the Pope that the cause of Cardinal di Pietro's punishment was his flagrant hostility to the State. In a letter addressed by the Pope to the cardinals, dated May 9th, the induction granted by metropolitans was declared to be of no effect; the bishops who had received it were designated as intruders; and the consecrating bishops

---

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 66 sq. New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. III., pp. 593 sq.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. III., pp. 83-90, and pp. 91-107 to the cardinals.

pronounced schismatics. After the disasters of the year 1813, the emperor saw more clearly than ever the necessity of coming to an understanding with the Holy See. Hence he now proposed to allow the Pope to return to Rome and to restore to him all the States of the Church that had not been included in the last imperial decree. Pius VII. replied, January 21, 1814, refusing to take back the patrimony of St. Peter unless it were restored in all its integrity.[1] He then received orders to set out for Savona at once, but before doing so addressed a last and touching allocution to the cardinals, and left whatever instructions he desired to give them with Cardinal *Mattei*, the Dean of the College.[2] Not one of the cardinals was allowed to accompany the Pope, who, while passing through France, was everywhere hailed with the most tender demonstrations of respect. He again entered Savona on the 11th of February, 1814. The cardinals were sent off to the various cities of the empire, each accompanied by a guard. After the whole of Italy had been lost, and when the half of France was in possession of the allied forces, Napoleon restored the departments of Rome and Trasimene to the Holy See (March 18th), and sent a courier to Savona with orders to have the Pope set at liberty. On the 25th of March the Holy Father arrived on the banks of the Tarno, where he was surrendered to the allied forces. He arrived at Bologna on the 31st of March, the very day that the allied armies made their triumphant entry into Paris. All those who had been imprisoned for religion's sake were at once set free. Cardinal *Consalvi*[3] rejoined the Pope at Cesena, and was again appointed Secretary of State. Finally, after having undergone so many and so great trials and hardships, Pius VII. made his entrance into Rome May 24, 1814, amid the joyous acclamations and splendid festivities of the whole people. In the following year the Congress of Vienna restored to him the Marches and Legations which had been wrested from his predecessor by the Treaty of *Tolentino*.

§ 392. *The Sad Condition of the Church in Germany, Italy, and Spain.*

At the very moment when the dawn of a brighter day was opening upon the Church of France a violent storm broke over that of *Germany*.[4] The statesmen to whom the grave political problems of that country were committed seemed to have no object in view other than to make good the losses sustained by the hereditary princes from the possessions of the Church. Hence, in accordance with the Treaty of *Lunéville* (1801), and the *resolutions of the Deputation of the empire at Ratisbon* (1803), it was decided that the principalities and possessions of the Church should be in part made over to France and in part *secularized*, to make good to civil princes their territorial losses on the left bank of the Rhine. In the Treaty of the Peace of Westphalia the principle had been laid down that secular princes should receive indemnification from the Church for territorial losses.[5] By

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 133. While negotiations were in progress, the Pope said: "Possibly my sins make me unworthy to again see Rome; but be assured that my successors will recover all the States belonging to them."

[2] *Pacca*, Vol. III., pp. 137-139. New Hist., &c., Bk. III., p. 623 sq.

[3] *Cenni*, Life of Card. Consalvi, Venice, 1824.

[4] *Pacca*, "Memorie storiche," on his sojourn in Germany, from 1786-1794, Roma, 1832; Germ., Augsburg, 1832. New Hist., Bk., II., pp. 205-222; Bk. III., p. 568. *Robiano*, T. III., p. 58 sq. *G. V. Schmid*, The Secularized Bishoprics of Germany, Gotha, 1858, with the device, taken from *Lucretius:* "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!" **Gams*, Vol. I., p. 304 sq. *Harl*, New Changes in the States and the Church of Germany, Berlin, 1804. *Thiers*, Histoire du consulat et de l'empire, T. IV., liv. XV. (sécularisation). **Buss* (Documentary), History of National and Territorial Churches, Schaffhausen, 1851, p. 776. *Starck*, in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. X., p. 345; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 381.

[5] "It is there significantly said that "*Ecclesiastical possessions are the cloth from which equivalents are to be cut.*" Cf. *Schwab*, Francis Berg, Prof. of Ch. Hist. at Würzburg, p. 321 sq.

the thirty-fifth paragraph of the resolutions adopted by the Deputation of the empire at Ratisbon, princes were empowered *to take complete possession* of "all property belonging to the foundations, abbeys, and monasteries within their States," and to dispose of it at their discretion, "in providing for public worship and instruction, in founding useful institutions, and *in restoring their own finances.*" These decrees were carried out in a spirit which only an iniquitous cupidity and the basest passions of man could inspire. The treasures, the jewels, the relics, and whatever else of value was to be found in the churches were seized, sold, and scattered.[1] It was argued that the property of ecclesiastical princes, of abbeys, and of chapters should be no less sacred than that of secular princes, and that the sacrifices necessary to indemnify the latter should in common justice be equally borne by all the estates of the empire. No attention was paid to these representations. Such was the cause of the extinction in Germany of the three ecclesiastical electorates of *Mentz*, *Cologne*, and *Treves;* of the seizure of the territorial possessions of sees directly subject to the empire, like the archbishopric of Salzburg and the bishoprics of Liége, Passau, Trent, Brixen, Constance, Bamberg, Freisingen, Eichstaedt, Würzburg, Münster, Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Osnabrück; and finally of the alienation of the lands of a considerable number of abbeys and convents.[2] As most of these terri-

[1] There are some curious disclosures concerning the monasteries situated in the present Grand-Duchy of Baden, in the work entitled "State of Affairs in Baden," Ratisbon, 1841-1843, 2 pts.; and concerning those of Würtemberg and Bavaria in *Gams*, Hist. of the Church of Christ in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 304 sq.

[2] According to the account left by *Klüber*, compiled from the diplomatic transactions of the Congress of Vienna, Part II., p. 404, the losses sustained by the Catholic Church on both banks of the Rhine amounted to 1,710 German, or 36,346 English square miles, representing a population of 3,162,576 and a yearly revenue of 21,026,000 florins, or $8,410,400, without including the monastic establishments. In Pt. III., p. 399, the *same author* says: "It is not as generally known as it should be how all these questions of indemnity were disposed of in the Congress of Rastadt, and particularly at Paris and Ratisbon in the years 1802 and 1803; what schemes were laid; what various interests came into play on the battle-field of diplomacy, once it became known that the temporal power had entered upon the work of disposing of ecclesiastical property. Time alone will lift the veil." Cf., also, *Menzel*, New Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. II., pp. 307 sq. The amount of indemnity obtained by certain princes is certainly remarkable. For example: *Prussia*, for a loss of 48 German (= 1,020 English) square miles, containing a population of 127,000, and yielding a yearly revenue of 1,400,000 florins, received, in the bishoprics of Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Münster, in the territory of Eichsfeld, and in the abbeys of Herford, Elten, Essen, Verden, and Cappenberg, an extent of territory equal to 235½ German, (= 5,005 English) square miles, containing a population of 559,000, and yielding a yearly revenue of 3,800,000 florins. Again, *Bavaria* (and the Palatinate on the Rhine), for 255 German (= 5,420 Eng.) sq. miles, with 800,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 5,000,000 of florins, received 290 Germ. (= 6,162 Eng.) sq. miles, with 800,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 6,000,000 of florins; *Würtemberg*, for 7 Germ. (= 170 Eng.) sq. miles, with 14,000 inhabitants, and a revenue of 336,000 florins, received 29 Germ. (= 616 Eng.) sq. miles, with 110,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 700,000 florins; *Baden*, for 8 Germ. (= 170 Eng.) sq. miles, with 25,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 250,000 florins, received 59¾ Germ. (=1,260 Eng.) sq. miles. with 237,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 1,540,000 florins; *Hesse-Darmstadt*, for 13 Germ. (= 276 Eng.) sq. miles, with 46,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 390,000 florins, received 95½ Germ. (= 2,021½ Eng.) sq. miles, with 124,500 inhabitants and a revenue of 753,000 florins; *Hesse-Cassel*, for ¾ of a Germ. (= 16 Eng.) sq. miles, with 2,300 inhabitants and a revenue of 30,000 florins, received 4½ Germ. (= 95 Eng.) sq. miles, with a population of 13,000 and a revenue of 60,000 florins, with an electorate thrown in.

tories passed out of the hands of their Catholic rulers and under the dominion of Protestant princes or governments, conducted on the principles of the eighteenth century or on the Napoleonic policy, the Catholic Church had neither recognized rights, defenders, nor protection of any sort. After Franconia had passed under the power of Bavaria, a Protestant faculty of theology was established at the University of Würzburg by the advice of the all-powerful minister, *Montgelas*, and the Socinian *Paulus*, surnamed "*the worthiest theologian of Germany*," called to preside over it (1803). As there were no Protestant students of divinity, Catholic seminarists and students intending to read theology were for some time forced to attend the lectures of Dr. Paulus. The Prince-Bishop protested, but to no purpose.[1]

The adroit and versatile Archchancellor, *Theodore Baron von Dalberg*, prevented the sacrifice of his eminent ecclesiastical position by transferring his metropolitan rights from Mentz to *Ratisbon* (February 1, 1803); creating a principality for himself out of Aschaffenburg, Ratisbon, Wetzlar, the House of Compostella at Frankfort, and the customs of the right bank of the Rhine; and extending his spiritual jurisdiction as *Primate of Germany* over a portion of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mentz, Cologne, and that part of Treves situated on the right bank of the Rhine, with the exception, however, of the States belonging to the King of Prussia, and as much of Salzburg as had been surrendered to Bavaria. If the Chancellor Dalberg owed both the preservation and increase of his dignity to the influence of Napoleon, it cannot be said that he was ungrateful, for, by his own personal authority, and without consulting either Pope or chapter, he appointed *Cardinal Fesch*, the emperor's uncle, his coadjutor. After the battle of Leipsig, and the overthrow of Napoleon's power in Germany, Dalberg renounced both his rights and his possessions as prince,[2] and contented himself with the Archbishopric of Ratisbon. He died February 10, 1817. In passing the decree of *secularization*, it was provided that the chapters that had been preserved should enjoy a fixed revenue, and monks and ecclesiastics receive a yearly pension. These allowances were small and ill-paid, and as to the churches no provision at all had been made for securing them a steady income. Again, by the death and dispersion of many of the canons, the bishops were in some sort left without chapters; they had not even the necessaries of life; and, consequently, after the death of some and the resignation of others, nearly all the sees of Germany became vacant. *Dalberg*, as Primate of Germany, and wielding a powerful influence, might have materially aided *Della Genga*, the Papal Nuncio, who was sent to Germany, in 1803, to re-establish the imprescriptible rights of the Church; but being imbued with the liberal principles of the age, he showed no disposition to do so. *Clement Wenceslaus*, formerly Prince-Elector of Treves, pleaded powerfully for the claims of the Church, but to no purpose.[3] To provide for the government of the dioceses that had fallen vacant, the Pope was obliged to appoint either *Vicars Apostolic* or *Vicars-General*, who not unfrequently were either lacking in energy, ignorant of the localities, or mistrusted by their diocesans. Such as were possessed of qualifications fitting them to rule with advantage over their churches, found the exercise of their functions and their communication with the Holy See impeded by innumerable obstacles. The hand of the Government was everywhere visible; even the sanctuary was not sacred against its presence. The police were constantly about the churches, giving all sorts of petty annoyances; prescribing the formularies of prayer to be used; supervising the recitation of the breviary, the administration of the sacraments, and the celebration of Mass; and giving instructions with regard to such trifling matters as wax candles and incense. The king, without asking the authorization of the Pope, established a new cathedral chapter at *Breslau*, June 8, 1812, but the canons were soon made to feel that they were out of place.[4]

---

[1] *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 472-509; *Menzel*, Mod. Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. II., pp. 344 sq.

[2] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. III., pp. 3-9; Fr. trans., Vol. 6, p. 4 sq.

[3] *Gams*, Vol. I., p. 379 sq.

[4] *Ritter*, Manual of Ch. Hist., 5th ed., Vol. II., pp. 538-542.

It need excite no surprise, then, that religious feeling, which had long since grown cold in Germany, should have become well-nigh extinct towards the close of the eighteenth century. However, amid a decline so deep and wide-spread, there were to be found shining examples of virtue and holiness. *Francis of Fürstenberg*[1] governed the diocese of Münster with wisdom, and in his own person illustrated a life of sanctity. Gathered about him were such men as *Overberg*, *Gaspar Maximilian*, and *Clement August von Droste*, whose lives were a perpetual argument in favour of the Catholic faith, and who, by word and example, drew others to embrace its teachings. Among these were such high and holy souls as the Princess *Gallitzin*, Count *Stolberg*, *Hemsterhuys*, and *Hamann*. The *theological school of the Grand Seminary of Mentz*, founded by the distinguished German bishop and pulpit-orator *Colmar* (1802-1818) exercised a very beneficial influence; counteracted in a measure the liberalistic tendencies of the Protestant University of the same city; and furnished at least one spot where sound doctrine might find a refuge and a home.

Italy and *Spain* being under the dominion of France, were subjected to the same disastrous changes in ecclesiastical affairs that took place in that country. Monasteries and congregations were suppressed, and the property of the Church confiscated; encroachments were daily made upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and ecclesiastical administration was constantly interfered with; and, finally, under colour of a sanction, forcibly extorted from the Pope, the number of bishoprics was diminished. For example, in *Piedmont* Cardinal *Caprara*, by a bull dated July 1, 1803, reduced the number of bishoprics from seventeen to eight; and in the States of the Church seventeen sees were suppressed. The concordat entered into with the Italian Republic, September 16, 1803, was more favourable to the Church than that with France, for the bishops were permitted to keep up communications with the Holy See.[2] But by a decree issued in February, 1804, by Vice-President *Melzi*, the privileges heretofore enjoyed were in a large measure withdrawn; and while the widest interpretation was given to clauses favourable to the Government, those recognizing the lawful authority of the Church were narrowly restricted.

Affairs in *Spain* were in no better condition than in Italy.[3] First of all, the monasteries were reduced to one-third of their original number; and, as a punishment for the disloyalty of the clergy who

[1] *Esser*, Francis of Fürstenberg, His Life, His Works, Münster, 1842. *Krabbe*, Historical Account of the Higher Institutions of Learning at Münster, *Ibid.*, 1852. *Katerkamp*, Memorabilia from the Life of Princess Gallitzin, Münster, 1828. *Nicolovius*, Fred. Leop., Count of Stolberg, Mentz, 1846. *Carvachi*, Biographical Reminiscences of Hamann, Münster, 1855. *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. I. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. XII, p. 434 sq., 637 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 9, pp. 232, 248 sq.; Vol. 13, p. 5.

[2] New Hist. of the Christian Church, Bk. II., p. 261 sq.; Bk. III., p. 574 sq.

[3] *Ibid.*, Bk. III., p. 462 sq., p. 750 sq.

took part in the Spanish insurrection some time later, *Joseph Bonaparte* suppressed all the convents of Regulars and Mendicants, including those of the Third Order or Tertiaries, and confiscated their property, allowing to each of the ejected religious a trifling sum for his support. The bishops and chapters were requested to draw up public addresses, declaring their adhesion to the principles of the Gallican Church. Of those who were weak enough to consent, the greater number were French bishops, who had been appointed by Napoleon to Spanish and Italian sees, the addresses ascribed to the others being mostly supposititious.

At this time the prisons of Italy were filled with cardinals, bishops, and prelates, whose only crime was loyalty to the principles of the Catholic Church; who, during their confinement, were subjected to treatment as harsh and cruel[1] as that to which their persecutor some time later himself fell a victim, when, hurled from the proudest throne in the world, the once powerful monarch, who had held in his hands the destinies of Europe, went to expiate both his faults and his glory on a desolate island in the middle of the ocean. While there the soul of this great genius, so long dazzled by prosperous fortune, was illuminated by the pure rays of the light of faith, and was once more drawn to the religion which, during the last years of his reign, he had so bitterly persecuted.[2]

§ 393. *The Restoration.*

The horrors of the Revolution, and the sufferings and long and bloody wars that followed it, revived a religious feeling in the hearts of men, and led them to appreciate and desire the blessings of religion. The claims of faith were again recognized, religion once more resumed its sway over men's souls, false philosophy for a time lost ground, Christianity was victorious, and the Church triumphant. With the Church there is no middle course, no half measures. Any one falling against this rock shall be crushed. This lesson was taught by the Revolution, and learned by the Revolutionists, but at a great cost. Those who had restored order, though loving revolution, dreaded its consequences, and were alarmed at the danger of again precipitating the country into another such abyss. They resolved to pursue a safe course.[3] Rulers recognizing the fact that religion is the firmest support of Government, and that the two stand or fall together, began to look with favour upon the Church, which they had so long disowned, renounced, and persecuted.

On the 26th of September, 1815, the three sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, then at Paris, entered into a compact known as the *Holy Alliance*, the object of which was, putting out of sight

[1] *Pacca*, Memoirs of the Life of Pius VII., Vol. II., p. 68 sq.

[2] Cfr. Sentimente de Napoléon sur la divinité de Jésus Christ; pensées inédites recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le comte *de Montholon* et publiées par M. le chevalier *de Beauterne*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1842. *Holzwarth*, Napoleon I.

[3] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 45, year 1860.

the distinctive teachings of the various churches, to re-establish the public law of nations and political life upon the general principles of Christianity.[1] This compact, entered into while their minds were filled with the enthusiasm inspired by a victory gained with such difficulty and at so many sacrifices, contained within itself the germs of dissolution and discord. Little by little its binding power relaxed, and, in 1840, three Christian monarchs were embarked in the incongruous enterprise of reconquering the Holy Land for the Turks.[2] An undertaking at once more worthy in itself, and more in harmony with the principles that were supposed to have inspired the framers of the Holy Alliance, was the repression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa, and the extinction of this barbarous traffic, so contrary to every Christian instinct and teaching, by the treaties of 1818 and 1841, made by England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia.

Still the enemies of the Church by no means considered themselves vanquished, and the conflict between *revolutionary principles* and the teaching of religion went on as furiously as ever, and not unfrequently occasioned the abridgment of the rights of the Church and the privileges of Religious Orders.

§ 394. *Rehabilitation of the Pope—Re-establishment of the Jesuits.*

Pius VII. made his solemn entry into Rome May 24, 1814, amid the joyful acclamations of the people, but was again driven from the city, after the escape of Napoleon from Elba (February 26, 1815), by the advance of his brother-in-law, Murat, who, having ambitious designs on the whole of Italy, entered the States of the Church at the head of his army. The Pope withdrew to Genoa,[3] where he received fresh proofs of the devoted attachment of the people of Italy. After the "Hundred Days," and Napoleon's complete overthrow in the disaster of Waterloo, the Pope once more returned to take peaceable possession of his faithful city, never again to leave it. Cardinal *Consalvi* was sent to the *Congress of Vienna*, to protest in the name of the Pope against whatever had been done hostile to the interests of the Holy See and the Universal Church, and in particular against the cession of the districts situated on the Po, the occupation of Ferrara by the Austrians, the loss of Avignon and the county of Venaissin, and the secularization and dissolution of the German empire. To the amazement of all Europe, Pius VII, who had been educated by the enemies of the Jesuits, re-established the Society of Jesus by the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, of August 7, 1814, the execution of which he intrusted to Cardinal *Pacca*, who

[1] Cf. New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. IV., p. 699 sq. Pope Pius VII. declined to join it, because, as he said, "a line of action, such as contemplated by the Holy Alliance, was within the *Church's own calling*."

[2] Cf. "The Holy Land and European Christendom," in the "Eccl. Gazette of South Germany," year 1841, nros. 1 and 3.

[3] *Pacca*, Journey of Pope Pius VII. to Genoa in the Spring of 1815, and his Return to Rome; Germ. trans., Augsburg, 1834.

in his younger days had been a great admirer of the *Lettres Provinciales.*

This act of tardy justice was practically a denial of the charges brought against the Jesuits at the time of their suppression.[1] The cardinal has left us a vivid picture of the impression which their re-establishment produced upon the minds of all.[2] According to the Pope's own statement, he acted on the demand of all Catholic Christendom. Attempts had already been made to revive the society under other names. In 1794 an association was founded for this purpose by the Fathers *De Broglie* and *De Tournely*, formerly members of the society, under the name of the *Society of the S. Heart;* and, in 1798, another by *Pancanari*, known as the *Society of the Faith of Jesus*, the members themselves being designated as the *Fathers of the Faith* (*Pères de la foi*). These latter formed the necleus for the new society in France. At the very opening of the pontificate of Pius VII., there were signs justifying the belief that the society would be soon re-established. As early as 1804, the Pope, at the solicitation of Ferdinand I., authorized its introduction into the kingdom of the *Two Sicilies* by the bull *Per alios*, issued July 31 of this year. Except in the *States of the Church*, none of their property was restored to the Jesuits. Elsewhere they were the objects of the same hatred, suspicion, and calumny that their predecessors had endured, and which has been their heritage in every age and country. They were received in *Naples*, in *Belgium*, and in *Ireland;* the instruction of youth was committed to them in *Sardinia;* in *France* they were permitted to exist undisturbed until the year 1828; in *England* they founded colleges at *Stonyhurst*, *Hodderhouse*, and other places;[3] and in *Spain* they were put in possession of their former rights and property by Ferdinand VII., after his own restoration in 1814. They were banished from Spain during the revolution of 1820, but returned with the restoration in 1823. The society was again suppressed in the Spanish dominions in 1835, and again re-established in 1844. They were once more expelled the kingdom by Espartero in 1854, and recalled by O'Donnell in 1858. They were finally driven out of the Spanish peninsula entirely after the revolution of 1868, and permitted to exist by sufferance only in the colonies. They were set over a college in Modena, in 1815; recalled to Switzerland and put in possession of their property by the Government of the Canton of *Valais*, in 1814; they reopened their college at *Fribourg* in September, 1818, which soon became one of the most celebrated of the society's; were invited, in 1844, by the Grand Council of *Lucerne* to take chairs in the theological school of that capital; and, when prosecuted, some time later, seven Catholic Cantons formed an alliance for their protection, but in November, 1847, they fell with the *Sonderbund*. Finally, they founded several colleges in the *United States* and the *Canadas*, where they have always enjoyed the most complete freedom. John Carroll, a professed Father, and some of his countrymen, who were completing their "third probation," in the Austrian dominions when the bull of suppression was issued, hastened to the United States, and continued to live in community until the society was re-established. From that time forward their growth has been rapid and they have now two provinces, one of Baltimore and the other of Missouri. Besides the philosophical and theological seminary and house of studies for their own scholastics at *Woodstock*, Maryland, they have *eighteen colleges* situated in the most considerable cities of the Union.[4]

---

[1] *Robiano*, Vol. II., pp. 494-538. Cf. New Hist., Bk. IV., p. 661.

[2] *Pacca*, Memoirs of Pius VII., Vol. III., p. 117 sq. *Dallas-Kerz*, The Jesuit Order, p. 300 sq. *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, p. 1334 sq.

[3] The colleges at present conducted by them in England are Stonyhurst, near Whalley, in Lancashire; Mt. St. Mary's, near Chesterfield; and Beaumont Lodge, near Windsor. They have also the Scholasticate of St. Beuno's, at St. Asaph. Besides these educational establishments, they have many flourishing religious houses in England and Scotland, and some missions in Guiana and Jamaica. In *Ireland* they conduct, besides the well-known College of *Clongowes*, others at Tullabeg, Dublin, Limerick, and Galway. They have also a novitiate at Milltown Park, Donnybrook. Attached to the Irish provinces are also missionary establishments in Melbourne, Australia. (Tr.)

[4] These are: Boston College, South Boston; College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.; St. Francis Xavier's, New York; St. John's, New York (Fordham); St. Joseph's, Philadelphia; St. John's, Frederick, Md.; Loyola, Baltimore; Gonzaga, Washington, D. C.; Georgetown, D. C.; Spring Hill, near Mobile, Ala.; St. Louis University, St.

They were invited by the *Austrian* Government to establish themselves in *Galicia* in 1820, and permitted to open a college at *Tarnopol*. After the Revolution of 1848 had passed away, their numbers and establishments rapidly increased. Seven State colleges, one chair in the Theological Faculty of Vienne, and the entire Theological Faculty of the University of Innsbruck were handed over to them by the Government. Their existence in Austria at present is precarious. In *Russia* their college at *Polotzk* was raised, in 1812, to the rank of a university; but owing to the conversion of several young noblemen, who had been educated by them, they fell under the displeasure of the Tzar, and by an imperial ukase of January 1, 1816 (December 20, 1815), their establishments in St. Petersburg and Moscow were closed; and, by another of March 25, 1820, the society was suppressed in all the Russias and Poland.

The Pope restored several other monastic Orders. The *Academy of the Catholic Religion* (*Academia di Religion Cattolica*), founded, in 1800, by Mgr. Coppola, Archbishop of Myra, and revived, in 1803, by Mgr. *Zamboni*, now received papal approbation. The *foreign colleges at Rome* were again reopened by Pius VII., the *German* September 8, 1817, the *English* and *Scotch* in 1818; and also the *College of the Propaganda*, to whose subsequent prosperity Cardinal *Pedicini* largely contributed. Of its once splendid library there remained at this time only its most ancient and most valuable Oriental manuscripts. Continuing the work of restoration, the Pope established several new chairs in the Roman University, and, by special treaties, entered into with France, Sardinia, and Bavaria (1817), Naples (1818), Prussia (1821), and other States, again, to his great joy, put the Church in these countries on a permanent footing. But with these consolations, which so gladdened the heart of the Father of Christendom, was mingled a feeling of poignant grief, occasioned by the stern necessity he was under of condemning the *Carbonari*, who, under the mask of patriotism and religion, were again fanning the dying embers of revolution into a fresh flame (September 13, 1821).[1]

On the other hand, the august and noble Pontiff, acting upon the inspiration of high and generous Christian sentiments, furnished an honourable asylum in Rome to Madame Laetitia, Napoleon's mother, and to the other members of the imperial family, who were persecuted by every other Government, and repelled from every other country. In July, 1823, Pius VII. accidentally fell and broke his thigh, and in consequence of the inflammation that set in, sunk

Louis, Mo.; College of the Immaculate Conception, New Orleans; St. Charles', Grand Coteau, La.; St. Xavier's, Cincinnati; St. Ignatius' College, San Francisco; Santa Clara, Cal.; St. Mary's, Kan.; Jersey City, N. J., Detroit, Mich.; Troy, N. Y.; Las Vegas, N. M.; Pueblo, Col., opened in 1877; and Omaha, Neb. (*Creighton Fund*), accepted in 1878.

[1] New Hist. of the Christian Church, Bk. IV., p. 777.

gradually and died on the 20th of August following, having reached the patriarchal age of eighty-two years.[1]

Neither captivity, exile, threats, nor any other sort of ill-treatment could break the spirit of this intrepid old man, who, down to the last day of his long life, defended the rights of the Church with unshaken fortitude and dauntless courage. When every sovereign of Europe was bowing down before the sceptre of Napoleon, the Successor of St. Peter, and he alone, resisted the conqueror, and manfully maintained his rights. And when the proud conqueror had fallen, and was expiating his crimes and his ambition on the island of St. Helena, the Pope, whom he had persecuted so long and so cruelly, was again alone among all the crowned heads of Europe to ask from the Cabinet of St. James some mitigation of his hard lot.

§ 395. *Reorganization of the Catholic Church in Sardinia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.*

Desirous of seeing religion once more flourishing in his States, which, owing to the frequent change of Government, since the breaking out of the French Revolution, had been deeply agitated, *Victor Emmanuel*, King of Sardinia, sent Count Barbaroux to Rome, in 1817, to conclude a concordat, according to the articles of which a new division of the dioceses was made, the number increased to nineteen, and those of Turin, Vercelli, and Genoa raised to the rank of archbishoprics.

In consequence of the vicissitudes through which his kingdom of the Two Sicilies had also passed since the opening of the century, King *Ferdinand* likewise concluded a concordat of thirty-six articles with the Holy See, which, embodying nearly the whole of ecclesiastical legislation, provided that the Catholic religion should be the religion of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; that the bishoprics on this side of the Straits of Messina should be consolidated, and the number of those on the other side increased;[2] that appointments to abbacies and canonries of free collation in cathedral and collegiate chapters should belong to the Pope during the first six months of the year, and during the next six months to the bishops; that all ecclesiastical property not yet alienated should be restored to the Church, but that ample guarantees of indemnity should be given to the present holders of the alienated estates; that the Church should have the right of acquiring new property in real estate; that certain restrictions on the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction should be removed; that both

[1] The reign of Pius VII. began March 21, 1800, and ended August 20, 1823, lasting twenty-three years and five months. That of his predecessor, Pius VI., began February 15, 1775, and ended August 29, 1799, lasting about twenty-four years and six months. The statement of Abbé *Darras* (Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 578) that Pius VII. reigned longer than any Pope since St. Peter is therefore incorrect, as is also the statement (*Ibid.*, p. 547) that Pius VII. died September 29, or, as he says on page 578, on September 20. *Artaud*, the Pope's biographer, who was at his bedside, says (Vol. II., p. 605) that he died at five o'clock on the morning of August 20. (Tr.)

[2] New Hist of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 755-760; and *Gams*, Vol. II., pp. 605 sq. and 668 sq.

clergy and laity should enjoy the fullest freedom of communication with the Holy See in all ecclesiastical affairs; and, finally, that the king and his successors should have the right of nominating to sees falling vacant.

§ 396. *The Catholic Church in Germany.* (See § 392.)

**Organon*, or Brief Information on the Ecclesiastical Organization of the Catholics in Germany, Augsburg, 1830. *Onymus*, The Situation of the Catholic Church in Germany, Würzburg, 1818. *R.....s*, Supplements to the Latest History of the Constitution of the Catholic Church in Germany, Strasburg, 1830. The concordats all printed off in *Phillips'* C. L., Vol. III., and that of *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 214 sq. *Plank*, Reflections on the Latest Changes in the Situation of the Cath. Church in Germany, Hanover, 1808. Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV. pp. 674-677. *Bülau*, Hist. of Germany from 1806-1830, Hamburg, 1842. *Wolfgang Menzel*, The Six Scores of Years from 1740-1860, Vol. III.

The Deputation of the empire, holding its sessions at Ratisbon, declared, on the 25th of February, 1803, in the most formal and solemn manner (§§ 60-63) that no change should be introduced into either the ecclesiastical or the political constitution of the secularized countries, and that the relations of Church and State should remain the same as heretofore, though it was undeniable that secularization was most unjust.[1] But, in spite of this declaration, and as a direct consequence of the secularization, ecclesiastical jurisdiction was subject to a number of harassing restrictions, against which the bishops in vain protested or assented only on condition that a concordat had been already concluded covering the cases in point.[2]

By the dissolution of the German empire, in 1806, the difficulties of the Church were increased. The ancient States of the empire, now enjoying complete independence in the administration of their internal affairs, were moreover strengthened by fresh accessions of territory and by the incorporation of cities and principalities hitherto free; and having thus gained an increase of power, and availing themselves of the Second Article of the Constitutive Act of the Confederation of the Rhine, repealing the laws of the German empire, they showed no disposition to respect the rights of the Church, consecrated by immemorial usage, by the recesses of diets, and the rescripts of emperors. Now that these Governments were sovereign, they refused to listen to any argument, even from Protestant writers, in defence of the rights of the Church. Notwithstanding that Napoleon had made freedom of Catholic worship a condition of admission for Protestant princes into the Confederation of the Rhine, the authority of the ordinaries was none the less subjected to numerous annoying restrictions, was sometimes ignored, and sometimes exercised by civil functionaries, who had hitherto busied themselves *circa sacra* in the name of the State. Hopes had been entertained that these affairs would be adjusted by a concordat, but the negotiations upon which such hopes were founded came to nothing.

---

[1] *Hist. of Prussia*, from the Peace of Hubertsburg (i. e., 1763) until the Second Capitulation of Paris (i. e., 1815), 1819; Vol. II., pp. 46-53. Baron *von Hormayr*, Univ. Hist. of Coeval Times, Vienna, 1817, Vol. II., pp. 205-218. *Gaspari*, Recess of the Deputation, Pt. II. p. 106. *Klüber*, Synopsis of the Congress of Vienna, Part II., p. 399.

[2] Reflections on the Situation of the Catholic Church within the Precincts of the Germanic Confederacy (not Rhenish, as the Fr. tr. has, Vol. IV., p. 60), Carlsruhe, 1818, p. 143. Cf., also, Inquiry into the Foundations of the Catholic Church in Germany, Frankfort, 1816.

In 1807, *Della Genga*, Archbishop of Tyre, went as Papal Nuncio to Munich and Stuttgart, but his mission was fruitless, being frustrated by the influence of the minister *Montgelas*, through whose efforts the slight hopes that were entertained of having the rights of the Church recognized were rendered still more desperate. Equally fruitless, were the good offices of Napoleon, who, on the 21st of September, 1807, in a letter addressed through *M. de Champagny* to Cardinal *Caprara*,[1] obtained the Pope's consent to have negotiations opened at *Paris*, with a view to concluding a concordat for Germany. Even on points the most necessary and essential, it seemed impossible to come to any understanding.

Finally, in 1814, when the Allies had reconquered the left bank of the Rhine, the Church of Germany began to entertain brighter hopes, which it was thought would be realized in the

CONGRESS OF VIENNA.[2]

The results of this Congress were by no means adequate to the true needs of the Church, the lawful wants of the people, or its own important and pacific mission. Among its members there was not a single influential and zealous defender of the rights of the Church. *Dalberg*, Archbishop of Ratisbon, who should have led in the matter, did not even appear in person in the Congress, and seemed to take no very great interest in its transactions. Not a single prince or statesman spoke a word in support of the rights of the Church. True, these were defended by the Papal Legate, Cardinal *Consalvi;* by *Wessenberg*, Vicar-General of Constance; by Baron *von Wambold*, Dean of the Chapter of Worms; by *Helfferich*, Prebendary of the Cathedral of Spire; and *Schies*, formerly Syndic of St. Andrew's, at Worms, then solicitor in the Superior Court at Mannheim, but their proposals were rejected and their reclamations unheeded.

Finding that all his efforts were vain, Cardinal *Consalvi* finally, on the 14th of June, 1815, *protested*[3] to the Congress, in the name of the Holy See, against all decisions injurious to the Catholic Church. As the Congress had failed to act, the German princes were obliged to apply directly to the Holy See for an adjustment of the ecclesiastical affairs of their several States.

To provide for the spritual wants of his Catholic subjects, the King of *Würtemberg* had a *vicar-general* appointed at *Ellwangen*, and adopted many other measures of great utility. *Bavaria* was the first of the German States to conclude a concordat with the Holy See, June 5, 1817, which, however, did not go into effect until September 8, 1821. The ecclesiastical affairs of *Prussia* were regulated by the bull *De salute animarum* of July 16, 1821, which was carried into execution two years later. In *Hanover*, besides a concordat (1824), referring especially to the dioceses of *Hildesheim* and *Osnabrück*, there was also the bull, *Impensa Romanorum Pontificum*, similar in its provisions to that published for Prussia, and which, as regards the diocese of Hildesheim, has been only imperfectly carried out since 1828; while the dotation provided for in the diocese of Osnabrück, though an honest and earnest effort was made to raise it by *George V.*, was not paid until 1858.

In the hope of stimulating more prompt action and securing

[1] Archives historiques et politiques, Paris, 1819. See *Organon*, p. 6 sq.

[2] See the Notes of Cardinal *Consalvi*, dated November 17, 1814, and June 14, 1815, and the Memorial of *Von Wessenberg*, Vic-Gen. of Constance, dated November 27, 1814, reported in the *Organon*, p. 9 sq. *Klüber*, The Acts of the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815), Erlangen, 1835, 8 vols. By the *same*, Translation of the Diplomatic Proceedings of the Congress of Vienna, Frankfort, 1816. *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchdom, pp. 792-808.

[3] *Florencourt*, Political Weekly, Cologne, 1854, Vol. I., nro. 11. "Protests entered by the Court of Rome against German Treaties of Peace."

more favourable terms, the princes of *Würtemberg*, *Baden*, *Electoral-Hesse*, *Hesse-Darmstadt*, *Nassau*, and *Oldenburg* combined together, and, in 1818, appointed at Frankfort *a committee on concordats*, charged with presenting their policy to the Holy See. Though as a whole the scheme was unsuccessful, Pius VII., by the bull *Provida solersque sollicitudo* of August 16, 1821, established an archbishopric at *Freiburg* for Baden, with *Rottenburg* in Würtemberg; *Limburg* in Nassau; *Mentz* in Hesse-Darmstadt; and *Fulda* in the Electorate of Hesse-Cassel as suffragan sees.[1] Finally, a concordat was concluded between *Holland* and the Holy See, June 18, 1827. By most of these treaties the divisions of the dioceses were made to correspond with the political boundaries; the dotation of the Church in *real estate* fixed upon; chapters established; the method of communicating with the Holy See prescribed; and many other matters arranged. In the Grand Duchy of *Saxe-Weimar* no regard was paid to the wishes of those most interested in regulating the affairs of churches and schools, and in consequence the Vicar-General of Fulda entered a protest in 1823.[2]

In *Saxony*, where the Protestant ministers were fiercely intolerant and the Protestant population sensitively suspicious, the king did all he could under the circumstances to promote the spiritual well-being of his Catholic subjects by ordinances published February 10, 1827.

§ 397. *Pontificate of Leo XII.* (1823-1829) *and Pius VIII.* (1829, 1830).

Continuatio Bullarii from Clement XIII., Tom. XVI.-XVIII. †*Artaud*, Hist. du Pape Léon, Paris, 1843. New Hist., Book IV., p. 793 sq. *Robiano*, T. IV.

The grief which the loss of Pius VII. caused the Church was in a measure alleviated by the elevation to the papal throne of Cardinal Hanibal della Genga, under the name of *Leo XII.* Owing to the tact and consummate ability displayed by Della Genga in several important and delicate missions, he gained the confidence of Pius VII., by whom he was appointed Vicar-General of Rome. The first official acts of Pope Leo gave promise that the hopes his elevation had inspired would be realized. His earliest attention was given to those evils by which the Church was more particularly threatened, and in the encyclical letter, *Ut primum ad summi Pontificatus*, of May 3, 1824, all the bishops of the Catholic world were very earnestly urged to warn the faithful against the two most dangerous enemies of the age, viz., *religious indifference*, which leads straight to deism and materialism; and *Bible Societies*, which, under pretence of spreading a knowledge of the Sacred Writings, misrepre-

[1] The New Ground-work of the Catholic System, according to Original Documents and Reports, Stuttgart, 1821. Cf. "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. XVIII., pp. 257-302. Cfr. infra, § 410.

[2] Cf. *Tübingen Quarterly*, 1824, p. 506 sq. and 727 sq. "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. VI., p. 259 sq.

sent their true sense in a thousand ways. This encyclical letter was bitterly denounced by Protestants, and ably defended by men like Sacy and Mezzofanti,[1] eminent alike for their learning and prudence. The bull *Quo graviora* of March 13, 1826, against the Carbonari, *Freemasons*,[2] and other secret societies, was perhaps less opportune. Finally, by the bull *Quod hoc ineunte sæculo*, the Pope proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825. Owing to the political troubles by which Europe was distracted, the jubilee of 1800 had not been celebrated, and this was therefore the first one for fifty years. In the bull announcing the joyful event, after deploring the errors that threatened the Church and the hatred evoked against her Head, the Pope called upon the whole Christian world to give heed to his voice, and to avail themselves of the opportunity of grace within their reach during this year of expiation, indulgence, and reconciliation. Pursuing his wise measures for the restoration of the Universal Church, Leo intrusted the direction of the Roman College to the *Jesuits*, invited men of distinguished ability to fill chairs in other universities, re-established the Irish College, gave special attention to the German College, and restored order to a number of churches in which it had been disturbed by the storms of the Revolution. Those countries of South America which had thrown off the yoke of Spain, and proclaimed republican forms of government, now sent petitions to the Holy Father, requesting him to give them lawful pastors. Leo granted the requests of the new South American Republics, and in a consistory, held in June, 1827, provided for the reorganization of the hierarchies in these countries. At the request of *Dom Pedro I.*, a similar provision was made for the empire of Brazil. Finally, he restored many of the schismatical churches of Asia to the unity of faith. But no effort of his apostolic zeal or demonstration of his paternal love could succeed in wholly extinguishing the last embers of Jansenism in the Netherlands.

The active and saintly life of this holy pontiff was cut short by an unexpected death on the 10th of February, 1829. He was succeeded by Cardinal Castiglioni (March 31), who took the name of Pius VIII. Like his predecessor, the new pontiff, in an encyclical letter of the 29th of May, warned the faithful against the dangers of religious indifference, Bible and secret societies, particularly that

[1] Journal des savans, année 1824. *Mezzofanti*, speaking of these Bibles, says: "In quibus versionibus vix dici potest, quot monstra, quot portenta in lucem edantur," and he adds that the spread of these translations in the East proves an obstacle to the propagation of the Gospel. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 106, and *Marshall*, Christian Missions.

[2] Cf. *Keller*, Univ. Hist. of Freemasonry, Giessen, 2nd edit., 1860. *Guericke*, Manual of Ch. H., 9th edit., Vol. III., p. 334. *Eckart*, Armory, Furnishing Proof for the Condemnation of the Order of Freemasons, Schaffhausen, 1855 sq.; by the *same*, Mysteries of the Pagan Temple, *ibid.*, 1860. *Hengstenberg*, Freemasonry and the Evangelical Pastorate, Berlin, 1854 sq., 3 vols. *Alban Stolz*, Mortar for Freemasons, 3rd edit., Freiburg, 1862. *Acacia-wij*, by the same, 1863. Bp. Baron von *Ketteler*, May an Orthodox Christian be a Freemason? 5th ed., Mentz, 1865. *Chambers'* Cyclopæd., art. *Mason, Masons Free.*

of *Freemasonry*, which, he said, favoured indifference in religious matters, and turned men's minds away from the sources of positive teaching and the practices of the Church.[1]

As a temporal ruler Pius VIII. was distinguished for his attention to the interests of the poorer classes, whom he provided with work and relieved of a portion of their taxes.

After the taking of Adrianople and the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Russia and the Porte, the Pope, as Head of the Universal Church, interposed in behalf of the Catholics of Armenia, who had been banished their country, and obtained for them the erection of an archbishopric in the very city of Constantinople, the recall of those in exile, the recognition of their rights, and the restoration of their property. At his urgent request, *Dom Pedro*, the Emperor of Brazil, abolished slavery within his States. But that which above everything else lends a special importance to his pontificate is the brief *Literis alteris abhinc*, which he addressed to the Archbishop of Cologne and his suffragans relative to *mixed* marriages.

As Pius VIII. had been encouraged in the beginning of his reign by the unexpected intelligence that the *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* had been passed April 13, 1829, during the ministry of *Sir Robert Peel*, so also when his life was drawing to a close, the keen grief he felt at seeing the spirit of revolt abroad everywhere was in a measure softened by the news of the conquest of Algiers by the French, July 5, 1830, who thus broke up the dens in which pirates had sought refuge, and their Christian victims had languished during many centuries. Bent under the weight of years, and overwhelmed with affliction at seeing the Church threatened by so many and so great disasters, Pius VIII. was called by Divine Providence to a better life on the 30th of November, 1830.

§ 398. *Pontificate of Gregory XVI.* (February 2, 1831—June 1, 1846).

Continuatio Bullarii from Clement XIII., T. XIX. Dizionario di erudizione, autore Gætano Moroni, T. XXXI., art. "Gregorio." *Frederic Bülau*, Univ. Hist. of the Years 1830-1838, Lps., 1838. *W. Menzel*, The 120 Years from 1740-1860, Vols. IV. and V. *Rheinwald*, Acta historico-ecclesiastica, Years 1835-1837, Hamburg, 1838-1840. *Von Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 674 sq.

When Pius VIII. died, the whole of Europe was violently convulsed by the revolution of July, the shock which it produced being everywhere felt. Apart from the agitations of the Secret Societies, and notably of the *Carbonari*, Italy was just beginning to be stirred by the breath of French liberalism. In no country was the spirit of revolution, which was stimulated by the death of the late Pope, more intense. The revolt, which had broken out in Bologna, spread

[1] This encyclical is given in Latin in "*The Catholic*" of 1829, Vol. XXXIII., pp. 254-264. Cf. *Freemasonry*, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 65–78, and Vol. XLI. See also New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 834-845.

rapidly, and when the conclave, after fifty days of conclave, on the 2nd of February, 1831, declared Cardinal *Mauro Capellari* Pope, it had reached the very gates of Rome. As this cardinal had but recently written a work celebrating the triumphs of the Holy See, the coincidence was somewhat remarkable.[1]

The accession of *Gregory XVI.* was hailed with universal joy, and the opening of his pontificate signalized by deeds of beneficence and acts indicating his firmness of character. "We are encouraged by the thought," said the new pontiff, in an encyclical letter, published three days after he had ascended the throne, "that the Father in heaven will not send us trials beyond our strength." In those days of revolt and disorder it required a man of unshaken confidence and iron will to take upon him the temporal and spiritual government of the church. Since Pius VIII. had been unsuccessful in suppressing the spirit of revolt in the Legations by his fatherly exhortations, the present Pope invoked the aid of Austria, and effected by arms what more conciliatory measures had failed to accomplish. Fearing that in the anarchy and disorder everywhere prevailing some churchmen might be led to forget their condition, Gregory XVI. wrote to the bishops of Poland and Belgium, strongly urging them not to mix up in political affairs, and reminding them that their ministry was a ministry of peace, and that subjects had duties towards their sovereigns which they might not refuse to perform. The organs of liberal opinion in Europe shortly after loudly proclaimed that the end of papal power and dignity had come at last. These sinister predictions were soon falsified. In an encyclical letter of August 15, 1832,[2] addressed to all the bishops of the Catholic world, the Pope proclaimed himself the enemy of the prevailing *false and dangerous spirit of innovation*, and solemnly avowed his intention of preserving and maintaining the ancient apostolic traditions. Once peace had been established in the States of the Church, the Pope devoted his energies to correcting old abuses and providing against new ones. In the autumn of 1833 the universities that had been closed during the revolutionary troubles were again opened and reorganized. Numerous works on *philosophy*, *dogmatic theology*, and *ecclesiastical and profane history* began now to make their appearance in the States of the Church.[3] Economical reforms were introduced into every branch of the administration;

[1] Il Trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa, Roma, 1799; Venezia, 1822, and many other editions; Germ., Augsburg, 1833, 2 pts. See New Hist of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., p. 845 sq. On the 7th of January, twenty-one votes were given to Cardinal *Giustiniani*, when, to the surprise of everyone, the Spanish ambassador *vetoed* the election of this distinguished churchman, who had for some considerable time been Nuncio at the Spanish Court. The right of veto was a privilege conceded to the Catholic Courts of France, Austria, and Spain. See *Groene*, Lives of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 487. (Tr.)

[2] *Bonn* Review of Philosophy and Catholic Theology, No. 3, pp. 197-208, where the original Latin text is given

[3] Among the writers on philosophy we may mention the name of *Pasquale Galuppi*, Saggio filosofico sulla critica della coscienza, which was, in 1820 and 1827, followed by Pure and Applied Logic, and likewise by Moral Philosophy. Then came, in 1830, his

high officers of State found guilty of either peculation or oppression were removed; all receipts and expenditures beginning with the year 1817 were closely examined to determine the legality of the privileges, pensions, and subsidies granted since that date; a new body of laws was promulgated in 1832, and a new penal code submitted to the judgment of the presidents of the various tribunals; a plan for a more equitable distribution of the tax levy on land was laid before deputies, who had come together from all parts of the Pontifical States;[1] chambers of commerce were established in Rome, in the cities of the provinces, and in all seaport towns; courts of appeal and criminal courts were thenceforth to be presided over by non-clerical judges; strict and impartial justice was dealt out to all alike;[2] the arts and sciences were encouraged with a munificence

New Investigations on the Origin of Ideas; of *Ventura* (de Methodo philosophandi), *Orsi*, *Anthony Rosmini-Serbati*, *Bonelli* (died at Rome on the 22nd of October, 1840), and others. Cf. "Philosophy in Italy," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 243 sq., 298-306; Vol. XI., pp. 294-305, 470-479, 542-553, 665-671; four articles, written by an Italian. Cf., also, *Theological Archives* of Munich, Year II., A.D. 1843, nro. 4. Bonelli wrote Disquisitio historica præcipuorum philosophiæ systematum, Romæ, 1829; Institutiones logicæ et metaphysicæ, Romæ, 1833, ed. II., 1835. As to Dogmatics, we quote *Perrone*, S.J. (†1876), Prælectiones Theologiæ, 9 vols., Romæ, 1835, which work has had upwards of 30 editions, and has been translated into French and German. Prælectiones Theologiæ, abridged from the above, 4 vols, 1845; 31st ed., 1864; both these works, 72 editions, until 1876; in fact, his lectures on theology since 1835 have superseded all others in nearly all the Catholic schools in both hemispheres. Peronne also wrote Synopsis Historiæ Theologiæ cum Philosophia comparatæ, Romæ, 1845; Turin, 1873. This part is generally found on the first pages of the Compendium; De Immaculato Conceptu B.V. Mariæ, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit, Romæ, 1847; Monasterii, 1849; Mediol, 1852. Thesis Dogmatica de Immac. B.V.M. Conceptione, Romæ et Ratisbon., 1855. De Matrimonio Christiano, 3 vols, Romæ, 1858; Leodii, 1861. De Virtutibus Fidei, Spei et Charitatis, Taurini, 1863 and 1867; Ratisb., 1865. De Virtute Religionis deque Mesmerismo, Somnambulismo et Spiritismo, Taurini, ed. II., 1867; Ratisb., 1866. De D. N. J. Christi Divinitate, 3 vols., Taurini, 1873. De Rom. Pont. infallibilitate, Taurini, 1874. Besides these dogmatical works, Father Perrone published many smaller ones on Catholic controversy, all of which were originally written in Italian, but soon appeared in other languages. The principal one of them is Il Protestantesimo e la regola di fede, 3 vols., Rome, 1853. The Abbé Chassay, in his biographical notice of Father Perrone, gives a list of them. They are sixteen in number. (Tr.) In Church History, *Delsignore*, Institutiones hist. eccl., ed. *Tizzani*, Romæ, 1838 sq. For Exegesis, *Patritius*, S.J., De interpretatione script. sacr., Romæ, ed. III., 1844. *Idem*, De evangeliis libri tres, 2 vols., 4to. In the department of Profane History, we mention *Garzetti's* work on the Situation and Constitution of Italy under the Roman Rule, ed. by *Marsiglio*, Milan, 1838, 3 vols. **Cesare Cantù*, Storia universale, Turin, 1837. Revised and reprinted at Palermo and Naples, 9th ed., 35 vols., Turin, 1864, and translated into German and French. The Germ. ed. is by *Bruehl*, Schaffhausen, 1849 sq., 13 vols; 2nd ed. continued by *Fehr*.

[1] *Tournon* (Etudes statitisques sur Rome, Paris, 1831) says: "There is perhaps no country in which it is more difficult to carry out reforms than in the States of the Church; for in no other country are there so many interests to be consulted, and in no other country is it so easy to make mistakes which would increase rather than diminish abuses." And he adds that though the Government is the most absolute in *form* in *reality* its administration is exceptionally mild and humane. Tournon was Prefect of Rome under Napoleon from 1810 to 1814.

[2] The office of Uditore Santissimo was abolished in 1831, and as a warning to all that no profession, and least of all the clerical, should enjoy any immunities from the penalties of crime, Gregory XVI., on the 4th of October, 1843, caused a Piedmontese priest, named *Dominic Abo*, to be beheaded in the Castle of Sant' Angelo in punishment of his guilt.

equalled only by the enlightened taste with which they were appreciated; the Etruscan Museum was founded in the Vatican; and finally, the *Basilica of St. Paul's*, which had been destroyed by fire on the 15th and 16th of July, 1823, was again built up from its ruins.[1] Such were some of the domestic labours that marked the early years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI., who, after having been raised to the papal throne, continued to live the life of a simple monk, observing the austere Rule of the Camaldolese, sleeping upon the floor, eating little, keeping late vigils, never idle, and praying always.[2] He gathered about his person the greatest men of his age, and employed their talents in his service. Cardinal *Lambruschini*, equally distinguished for learning and statesmanship, was appointed his Secretary of State, in which office he set forth and maintained, under the most trying circumstances, the true principles and polity of the Catholic Church. As Leo X., in a former age, had rewarded the virtues and talents of *Bembo* and *Sadolet*, by making them members of the Sacred College, so now did Gregory confer a similar mark of appreciation upon the scholarly *Angelo Mai* († 1854) and *Mezzofanti*, the marvellous linguist († 1849).[3]

The tender heart of Gregory XVI., which had but recently been comforted by the peaceful settlement of affairs in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Poland, was overwhelmed with grief when he learned that *Spain*, that country of glorious Catholic traditions, was also convulsed by the conflicts of civil strife, her constitution overturned, her faith dimmed, and her attachment to the Holy See weakened; that one of the ablest and most eloquent defenders of Christianity and the Church had lighted the torch of revolt at the altar of God, and prostituted the words of Holy Writ to justify contempt of authority, hatred of kings, rebellion, and all the train of evils that follow in its wake; that Clement, the venerable *Archbishop of Cologne*, and the holy Archbishop of *Gnesen* and *Posen*, had been violently thrust from their sees; and, finally, that the Greeks, who had been restored to unity during the pontificate of Clement VIII., had been once more torn from communion with Rome by means the most despicable and atrocious. There was no duty of his high office that Gregory left unperformed. He warned the faithful against the errors contained in the systems of *Hermes* and *Bautain*, and against the dangerous and wicked tendencies of the teachings of the Abbé *de Lamennais*; he protested against the violation of the rights of bishops by the King of Prussia; and having remonstrated to no purpose with the Tzar of Russia, published, July 22, 1842, an allocution addressed to the

1 Gregory XVI. addressed a circular letter to all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Christian world, requesting contributions for the restoration of this splendid monument, raised to the honour of the *Apostle of the Gentiles*. It had withstood the vicissitudes of fifteen centuries, and previously to the Reformation was, as the national Church of England, under the special patronage of her kings.

2 Cf. *Geramb*, Journey from La Trappe to Rome, p. 127, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1839.

3 On *Mezzofanti*, see Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. X., pp. 200 sq. and 271 sq.

cardinals,[1] in which, after recounting the tyrannical acts of that autocrat, he bitterly complained of the sad condition of the Catholic Church in the Russian empire. By this last act Gregory closed the mouths of the enemies of the Holy See, who reproached him with neglecting one of his most sacred duties in averting his eyes from the misfortunes of these poor people, and in ceasing to defend the rights of the Church, from fear of giving offence to the Autocrat of the North (December 13, 1845). By the firmness, fortitude, and prudence which he displayed in encountering the storms raised against him in the North, in the East, and in the West, Gregory made for himself a name in history which will never be obscured; and future generations will some day render proper homage to the shining merits of this illustrious successor of St. Peter. He died June 1, 1846.

§ 399. *The Catholic Church in France under the Bourbons.*

By the Constitutional Charter of July 4, 1814, *Louis XVIII.* granted toleration to every form of worship, but, consistently with the religious traditions of his House, declared the *Catholic* to be the religion of the State. Hoping to find in religion the surest support of his still insecure power, he put forth his best efforts to strengthen the authority of the Church in France, to revive the teachings of faith, and encourage religious habits in those Frenchmen who for a half of a century had been by turns political enthusiasts, votaries of pleasure, gallant soldiers, industrious workmen, Christians when it was fashionable and a mark of good breeding to be such,[2] at all times impressionable, easily led astray and prompt to return. Many obstacles, however, stood in the way of the accomplishment of this noble design.

Missionaries sent among the people to preach the Gospel were at times imprudently zealous, and, by their unseemly conduct in some places, laid themselves open to the biting sarcasm and vituperative calumny of their polemical adversaries, and gave colour of excuse to the petitions that were sent up to the Chambers against them, and to the popular uprisings that took place at Brest and Paris. Those who had passed their youth among the terrible scenes of the Revolution had ceased to relish any writings except those of Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, Helvetius, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which, having been forbidden to be published by Napoleon, now, that the press had become free, appeared in thousands of editions, and were sold at a price so trifling as to place them within the reach of everyone. The evil influence of these works were in a measure counteracted

---

[1] The allocution and the leading facts are found in the pamphlet entitled "The Czar and the Successor of St. Peter," by *Sausen*, Mentz, 1843. "Persecutions and Sufferings of the Catholic Church in Russia," a work based on unpublished Documents, by a former Russian Counsellor of State, Paris, 1842. Cf. *Theiner*, Situation of the Catholic Church of the Two Rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II. down to our own times. Review of the History of Russia, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. V., pp. 4-16, 98 sq., 129 sq.; Vol. IX., p. 698 sq. Relations of the Russian Church to Constantinople and Her Thraldom under the Autocracy of the Czar, *ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 768 sq.; Vol. XI., p. 120 sq. Gregory XVI. and the Emperor of all the Russias, *ibid.*, Vol. X., pp. 455-491, 583 sq., 647 sq.

[2] Cf. *Boost*, New Hist. of France, 1st ed., p. 322 sq.; *Gams*, New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., p. 655 sq

by the *Catholic Society*, under the direction of *Duke Matthew de Montmorency, for the diffusion of Catholic literature*. The bishops, in a letter dated May 30, 1819, laid a statement of the condition of affairs before the Pope, sorrowfully deploring their existence. But before the Church in France could make any real progress towards reconstruction, it was of the first importance that the vacant sees should be filled, and a period put to the condition of uncertainty resulting from the concordat of 1801.

After the failure of the mission of M. *de Persigny*, formerly Bishop of Saint-Malo, and subsequently Archbishop of Paris, Count *de Blacas*, the king's minister, was sent to Rome to open negotiations, with a view to concluding a new concordat. Of the difficulties to be set aside, only two were of great consequence, namely, the obligation of the clergy to take the oath prescribed by the Charter, and the refusal of the old bishops to resign their sees. The former was set aside by assurance of Count de Blacas that the oath bound only within the limits of civil obedience, and in no way interfered with the duties of clergymen to God and to the Church; and the latter ceased to exist after the disinterested declaration, drawn up at Paris, November 8, 1816, by the six bishops concerned, to the effect that they were willing to do whatever the Holy Father, the king, and the well-being of the Church in France might require.[1] *The new concordat*, signed by both the Holy See and Louis XVIII. on the 11th of July, and published by papal bull eight days later, *restored the one entered into between Leo X. and Francis I.* at Bologna in 1515, and provided for the abrogation of the concordat of 1801 and the abolition of the *Organic Laws*, in so far as these conflicted with the teachings and laws of the Church. Of the sees suppressed by the bull *Qui Christi Domini*, of November 29, 1801, forty-seven were to be restored, and the sixty archbishoprics and bishoprics erected in the same year were to remain unchanged, and the actual incumbents to retain undisturbed possession. Should, however, any new division of either the old dioceses or the new be deemed necessary or advantageous, it might not be made except with the consent of the bishops, or of the chapters of such bishoprics as chanced to be vacant. Churches were to have adequate endowments, either in real estate or in incomes, secured by the Government, and special attention was to be given to the organization of seminaries. Desirous of promptly carrying into effect an instrument so favourable to the Church, the Pope was just about to publish a bull relative to the new division of the dioceses, when the Chambers rejected the concordat, on the ground that the bishoprics were excessive in number, and that it contained many articles inimical to the Liberties of the Gallican Church. In 1822 a temporary arrangement was entered into between the Pope and the king, with the consent of the Chambers, by which the number of bishoprics was increased to eighty, fourteen of which were metropolitan and sixty-six suffragan sees. Cathedral chapters were also organized, and greater and smaller seminaries and faculties of theology established. There was a great lack of priests, and although the number ordained in 1823 was two hundred in excess of those who died in the same year, there were still thirteen thousand required to fill the vacant posts and offices. The king now called attention to the revenues of the Church, and the Chambers in consequence voted a subsidy of 3,900,000 francs, thus rendering the position of the clergy more secure and independent. After a gallant struggle, in which he displayed the marvellous powers of his fervid eloquence *Chateaubriand* obtained for the clergy the right of accepting grants of real estate, and the property accumulated from this source in a short time was valued at two millions of francs. The clergy, on their part, were both zealous and devoted. They searched out and brought together, in an establishment specially set apart for the purpose, a large number of Savoyard children, who had hitherto been given over to every vice, and permitted to grow up without religious instruction of any kind. The Abbé *Loewenbroek*, a native of Lorraine, devoted himself to the service of the German workingmen, of whom there were at times twenty-five thousand in Paris, and whose religious wants and instruction had been previously wholly neglected. The Abbé *Arnoux* opened a reformatory for criminals. The *Priests of the Mission*, who, by an ordinance of October, 1816, had been permitted to return to their former houses, and the Priests of the Holy Ghost, hastened to place themselves at the disposal of the bishops, to do service in communities that had been deprived of their pastors. The Trappists returned to France, took possession of their ancient Abbey of Meilleray, and, by fidelity to their austere Rule, once more revived purity of morals among their countrymen.

---

[1] This document is given in the New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., p. 714 sq.; also the Concordat of 1817. See the original Latin text in *Robiano*, Vol. III., pp. 403-420.

The *Brothers of the Christian Schools* and the *Ursuline Nuns* entered joyfully upon their work of instructing and educating the youth of both sexes. Pious laymen also formed themselves into holy associations for the instruction of youth, the diffusion of wholesome literature, the promotion of the missions, the service of the sick, and other such charitable offices as were required by the growing needs of religion.[1] The most important of these was the *Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, founded at Lyons in 1822.

People no longer dared, as in days gone by, to make a boast of their infidelity in good society. *Lamartine* (b. 1790, d. 1869)[2] was the favourite poet of the better educated classes, and his poems, which breathe a deeply religious and Christian spirit, replaced in public admiration the pagan and impious literature of the eighteenth century. Others also contributed largely to bring about this revolution in public taste, and among them the Abbé *de Lamennais* (b. 1782, d. 1854)[3] the eloquent defender of the infallibility of the Church, and the bold and spirited adversary of Gallicanism; *De Maistre* (b. 1754, d. 1821),[4] that splendid genius and great writer; *Bonald* (b. 1754, d. 1840)[5] the powerful advocate of civil and particularly of ecclesiastical authority; *Frayssinous* (b. May 9, 1765, d. May 31, 1841),[6] the able Christian apologist; and *Boulogne* († May 13, 1825),[7] the intrepid bishop and great preacher. Writers hitherto hostile to the Church retracted their errors and bore witness to the truth of Christianity. *Peter Henry Larcher*, the celebrated Greek scholar (b. 1736, d. 1812), disavowed the notes, which he, assisted by some pretentious philosophers, had written on Herodotus, the scope of which was, not to render testimony to historic truth, but to undermine the foundations of the Christian religion by throwing discredit upon the chronology of Holy Writ. In 1820 the famous *Jean-Baptiste Robinet* also repudiated his work,

[1] There were, in 1825, 2,833 institutions belonging to Religious Orders of females, and of these 1,533 received subsidies from Government.

[2] Méditations poétiques, Paris, 1820. Nouvelles Méditations, Paris, 1823. Harmonies poétiques et religeuses, Paris, 1830, 2 vols. Chant du Sacre, Paris, 1825.

[3] Essai sur l'indifference en matière de religion, Paris, 1817 sq., 2 vols. A little later on, together with the Défense de l'essai, 5 vols., Paris, 1827. De la Religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil, Paris, 1825; 3rd edit., 1826. Mélanges, Paris, 1826. Des Progrès de la revolution et de la guerre contre l'Eglise, Paris, 1829.

[4] Du Pape, Lyons, 1819; Par., 1820, 2 vols.; English by *McD. Dawson;* Germ. by *M. Lieber*, Frankfort, 1822. De l'église gallicane, &c., Lyons and Paris, 1821; Germ. by *Klee*, Frkft., 1824. Les Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg, ou Entretiens sur le gouvernement temporel de la Providence, 2 vols., Paris, 1821; Germ. by *Lieber*, with Dissertations by *Windischmann*, Frkft., 1825.

[5] Œuvres, 21 vols., Paris, 1817, to which was added: Démonstration philosophique des principes constitutifs de la société, Paris, 1830. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XII., p. 124; Fr. tr., Vol. 3, p. 190 sq.

[6] Notice sur la vie de Mgr. Frayssinous, évêque d'Hermopolis, par le *baron Henrion. Frayssinous*, Défense du christianisme, ou Conferences sur la religion. These lectures on the proofs of Christianity, delivered in the Church of St. Sulpice, between the years 1803 and 1809, and again between 1814 and 1822, made his reputation. The cultivated youth of the capital were drawn by the splendour of his genius and the charm of his eloquence, and thus prevented from being carried away by the popular philosophy of the day. Between the years 1825 and 1843, fifteen editions of the Défense du Christianisme, in 3 vols., were published, and the work has been translated into many languages. Germ., Pesth, 1830, 4 pts.

[7] Œuvres, Paris, 1826 sq.; 8 vols., Germ., by *Raess* and *Weis*, Frkft., 1830 sq., 4 vols.

Livre de la Nature, in which he aimed at destroying all religious principles and extinguishing all religious feeling.

Louis XVIII. died September 19, 1824, and during the reign of his successor, *Charles X.*, the conflict between the Royalists and the Constitutionalists raged more fiercely than ever. Even wise and moderate men were not agreed as to how far the influence of the Church should extend. Charles X. showed a disposition to strengthen the authority of the Church and to set his face against the spirit of revolution. With this view he endeavoured to have the Chamber of Deputies pass a *law on sacrilege* (1825), punishing with severe penalties any offence against the religion of the State. On the other hand, the Gallican tenets were vigorously attacked by an illustrious writer, the Abbé de Lamennais; and a number of French cardinals, archbishops, and bishops drew up and laid before the king, April 3, 1826, a statement of their grievances, which, some time later, received the approval of sixty other prelates.

On the 25th of May, 1827, the Minister of Public Worship, Mgr. Frayssinous, Bishop of Hermopolis *in partibus*, rose in the Chamber of Deputies and repelled the charges of ambition and ultramontanism imputed to many of the clergy, and gave a clear statement of the policy of the Government. While freely allowing that the intentions and efforts of Charles X. to forward the interests of religion in his dominions were praiseworthy, it must be also acknowledged that he lacked the qualifications necessary to regenerate his people. Like the Jesuits and those who were spending themselves on the missions for the weal of others, he was assailed by irreligious and revolutionary agitators, who, during a period of bloody and ceaseless wars, when religious instruction was no longer given, had been corrupted to the very core by the reading of immoral and infidel works. Symptoms calculated to excite alarm began to manifest themselves in some cities of the kingdom.[1] The party, which during a Revolution that filled France and the whole of Europe with terror, and under the empire that succeeded, had expiated in one or other of the eight imperial bastiles the slightest revolutionary act, began now to revive under the imbecile rule of the Bourbons. The banner of liberty was again hoisted; religion and its ministers derided; morality attacked with sophisms a thousand times repeated and as often refuted; every possible means employed to excite the passions of the discontented and to rouse into action that dangerous element of every population that is ever desirous of change; the wildest political theories proclaimed; and the Government itself ridiculed and made an object of contemptuous derision. As to the Government, it must be said that, though weak, it meant well, and though zealous for good, it was destitute alike of the energy and prudence necessary to accomplish it, and, while intent upon maintaining itself, daily lost ground by making injudicious concessions. Availing themselves of the exclusive and

[1] *Boost*, New Hist of France, 1st ed., p. 330 sq.

illiberal privileges of the *University* founded by Napoleon, the members of the Opposition demanded that the seven colleges under the direction of the Jesuits should be closed, and the king, by royal ordinance of July 16, 1828, granted their demand.[1] Emboldened by every fresh concession, they extended their operations from Paris to all the departments; directed the action of the electors; established affiliated societies to aid in controlling the elections; and by degrees increased the number of their Deputies in the Chamber. Affairs came to a crisis under the ministry of *M. de Martignac*, through whose prudent management the Government was still enabled to retain a measure of public confidence. New demands on the part of the Government called forth an unexpected resistance, and Charles X., weary of yielding where to yield was worse than useless, promptly declared that he would make no further concessions and that in future he would act as the interests of the throne and of religion seemed to require. Relying upon the advice and support of those immediately about him, he dismissed the Martignac ministry, which alone was able to harmonize conflicting parties and uphold the uncertain fortunes of royalty. The new aggressive policy now inaugurated gave offence to all parties, and made them a unit against the Government. New cabinets were successively formed and dismissed, until finally the one presided over by *Prince de Polignac*, which Talleyrand ironically styled *the impossible ministry*, was appointed. When conciliatory measures would not answer, this minister attempted to awe the public into submission (expedition to Algiers, &c.); but the Press, which nothing could silence, kept up its attacks, which became daily more violent and personal. In reply to a speech from the throne, on the occasion of the opening of the Chambers on the 2nd of March, 1830, an address, declaring that the ministry did not enjoy the confidence of the country, was carried by a vote of 221 against 181. The king, in consequence, by an ordinance of the 16th of May, declared the Chamber of Deputies dissolved. A new election took place, and the 221 were again returned, without exception. Charles, seeing that affairs were desperate, determined to take advantage of the somewhat vague wording of the Fourteenth Article of the Charter, empowering the sovereign "to make regulations and decrees necessary for the execution of the laws and the safety of the State," and on the 26th of July published his *five celebrated ordinances* in the *Moniteur*. These suspended the liberty of the Press; dissolved the newly elected Chamber of Deputies; reduced the number of Deputies from 430 to 258; convoked the two Chambers to meet the 28th of the following September; and made some new royalist appointments for the Council of State. The editors and publishers of newspapers, headed by M. Thiers, then editor of the *National*, protested against the ordinances. On the following day, July 27th, a conflict took place in the streets between the gendarmes and the citizens; on the 28th Paris was declared in a state of siege, and in an encounter with the populace the

[1] *Robiano*, L. c., T. IV., p. 212; and "*The Catholic*" of 1828, nro. 12.

royalist troops were victorious; on the 29th, owing to some blundering and the defection of two regiments, the mob gained possession of the Tuilleries, compelled the king's forces to withdraw from Paris, dethroned the elder branch of the Bourbons, and transferred the government to the *Duke of Orleans*, who took the title of *Louis Philippe I.* By the Protestants this change of government was hailed as the beginning of a new era for Protestantism in France; but their predictions were premature, and were destined not to be verified by the events that followed.

§ 400. *Continuation—The Catholic Church in France under Louis Philippe.*

Crétineau-Joly, Histoire de Louis Philippe d'Orléans et de l'Orléanisme, Paris, 1862. *Boost*, New Hist. of France, 5th period, p. 344 sq. *L. Blanc*, Histoire de dix ans, chap. 18. *W. Menzel*, L. c., Vols. IV. and V. *Scharpf*, Lectures on New Ch. H., nro. 1, p. 67-135. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. III., p. 72 sq.

The Church in France did not escape the storm that overturned the throne of the Bourbons in 1830. By the new Charter, the Catholic religion was declared to be, not the religion of the State, but the religion of the majority of the French people.

Although the Pope, in reply to an inquiry from Mgr. *de Quelen*, Archbishop of Paris, authorised the usual prayers to be said for King Louis Philippe, and instructed the bishops to submit to the new Government, the clergy long continued to be regarded with suspicion by their implacable enemies of the liberal party.

Owing to some imprudent conduct of the Legitimists, on the occasion of the funeral service of the *Duke de Berry*, in the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, February 14, 1831, a fanatical mob, already maddened by excessive indulgence, it being the season of carnival, rushed in and sacked the church, and hurrying thence to the archbishop's palace, perpetrated similar outrages. For two days an infuriated multitude rushed through the streets, everywhere erasing the fleur-de-lis from the escutcheon of France, and sacking churches. They were at length overcome by the National Guard.[1] To these shocking scenes succeeded the ravages of disease. The cholera, a plague hitherto unknown in Europe, raged with such violence in Paris that in one day alone (April 10, 1832) eighteen hundred persons fell victims to the scourge. The first appointments to bishoprics after the revolution of July did not prove to be the very best that could be made.[2] Associated with *Montalembert*, *Gerbet*, and *Lacordaire*, Abbé *de Lamennais*, who believed himself called to exercise a powerful influence on the political and religious future of France, started a journal, which bore the significant title of *l'Avenir*, and the motto, "God and Freedom." An ardent advocate of the complete independence of the Church, and a determined enemy of all State

1 *The Catholic*, Oct. nro. of 1831. Mgr. *de Quelen* pendant dix ans, par *J. F. Bellamare*, Paris, 1843.

2 *Bonn*, Periodical, No. 51, pp. 204, 205.

interference in spiritual affairs, he pushed his principles to their last consequences, maintaining that the clergy should decline to accept any salary from Government,[1] and that the Church, once more reduced to her condition of poverty in the primitive ages, would no longer place her trust in anything save in the power of Him who alone is her true Head. To these questions of discipline he soon joined others of a strictly doctrinal character, concerning which he held wholly erroneous views, as, for example, that the subjective ground and reality of certitude are not in the individual reason, but in the universal reason and general acceptance (*sensus communis*) of mankind.[2] The views of De Lamennais on the complete severance of Church and State and on the *sensus communis* were condemned by Gregory XVI. in an encyclical letter of the 15th of August, 1832. All the bishops of France prohibited the reading of *l'Avenir* in their dioceses, and the publication of the journal was in consequence suspended. M. de Lamennais retracted, but the Pope suspected his sincerity, and his fears were justified when, some time later, *Les Paroles d'un Croyant* and *Le Livre du Peuple*, both written with fervid eloquence and extraordinary brilliancy, made their appearance.[3] With a strange confusion of the most elementary ideas, the author advocated the murder of kings, the assumption by the clergy of the leadership in popular insurrections, and the adoption of the cross as the universal standard of nations in revolt, and appealed to the Gospel as a sanction for his wild vagaries. His words are seemingly the words of the Gospel, being in fact a horrid travesty of the Sacred Writings, put together with a view to incite to crime. Being no longer able to simulate the character of a priest, the Abbé de Lamennais at length threw off all disguise, and was regarded by all as a democrat and Jacobin of the most extreme school. But though he voluntarily cut himself off from communion with the Church he desired to make the embodiment of revolution, he failed to bring with him any of that brilliant cluster of men who had encouraged his early efforts and shared his first labours; and the *Abbé Gerbet*, now that the friend of his youth had become the enemy of all that he himself held most dear, after a painful struggle with his feelings, entered the lists against him.[4]

[1] *The Catholic*, year 1831; Jan. nro. of 1833; Sept. Append., p. XLI.; Dec. Append., p. XXXVII.; A. D. 1834, Febr. Append., p. XXV. sq.; March Append., p. LI. sq.

[2] *Bonn*, Philosophical and Theological *Review*, nro. 19, p. 177.

[3] Paroles d'un Croyant, Paris, 1833. *Bautain*, Réponse d'un chrétien aux paroles d'un croyant, Strasbourg et Paris, 1834. Paroles d'un voyant à M. de Lamennais par *Ch. Faider*, Bruxelles, 1834. Paroles d'un croyant, par l'abbé de Lamennais quand il était croyant, Brux., 1828. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Reflections on some Writings of De Lamennais, Jena, 1834. *Carové*, Criticism of the Pilgrims of Mickiewicz; of the Words of a Believer, by Lamennais; of the Answers of *Bautain*, *Faider*, &c. Conf. the Review made thereon by Dr. *Hock*, in the *Bonn* Periodical, nro. 20, p. 103-126; conf. *ibid.*, nro. 10, p. 145-165, and nro. 11, p. 192 sq.

[4] Abbé *Gerbet* wrote the following lines on the subject: "On sent tout se que ces paroles me coutent. Celui qui déclare une guerre ouverte à l'église, qui prophétise sa ruine, qui, dans les dernières pages de l'écrit qu'il vient de publier, n'a pas craint d'outrager, par le plus brutal sarcasme, l'auguste vieillard, que la chrétienté salue du nom de Père, a eu en moi un ancien ami, qui l'aimait d'une amitié née au pied des autels, et qui

Another pretended reformer, the *Abbé Châtel*, formerly a chaplain in the army, followed a less circuitous route for the accomplishment of his object. Believing the Revolution of July favourable to the establishment of a "French Catholic Church," he began to proclaim his new teachings in August, 1830.

Shortly after the Revolution he published a profession of faith, had himself consecrated bishop by Fabre-Palaprat, a "Constitutional" prelate, and opened a place of meeting in a rented hall in the faubourg Saint-Denis, in Paris, where he officiated as primate of the new religion. He held Christ to be only a model-man, abolished the confessional, fasting, and celibacy, denied the infallibility of the Church, and recognized no rule of faith other than the individual reason. Retaining only a few external forms of Catholic worship, and preaching a rank and superficial rationalism,[1] it is somewhat puzzling how he could have designated his new system, if such it can be called, the "*Catholic Church.*" He was not more successful than misguided reformers have ever been, and seems to have had only very indistinct and inaccurate notions of the principles upon which his reform was based, not unfrequently rejecting and refuting to-day what he had taught and upheld yesterday. Of all subjects, religious ones were the most distasteful to him. His sermons were by turns dogmatical and political, blasphemous and ridiculous. For example, one day he would begin by saying that he was about to preach on the dignity of women, and at the close of his discourse would distribute bouquets to the ladies; and the next, that divine service would be held in honour of Napoleon, whom he had placed upon his new calendar of saints. In his catechism[2] he taught that the natural law comprehends the whole of religion, that Christ had died a martyr to this belief, and that his death was sublime only because it was a witness to its truth. The teachings of the Abbé Châtel never exerted a very wide influence, and his sect gradually dwindled away after its places of meeting had been closed by order of the Government in 1842. It again revived after the Revolution of February 24, 1848, but was again suppressed by the civil authority of 1850. The Abbé himself remained obstinate, publishing for a time a journal at Brussels, in which he defended his opinions, and ending his days as a postmaster in 1857. *Auzou*, one of his leading disciples, had been a seminarist at Versailles, and after his expulsion had himself ordained by Poulard, receiving all the orders in a single day. He subsequently repented, and was reconciled to the Church, begging all those whom he had led astray to follow his example.

Sharing the opinion of Châtel that the events of the July Revolution marked the opening of an era favourable to their purposes, the Freemasons, who, under the name of *Templars*, had secretly established a Lodge in Paris at the commencement of the eighteenth century, began now to publicly put forward their claims to be regarded as the original Church. After being for a time the object of some curiosity, they passed out of public view, having excited no permanent interest in their pretensions.

The Revolution of 1830, which had called into life so many and so various interests, passions, aspirations, and sects, inspired the disciples of *Saint-Simon*[3] with the idea of forming a regular organization, which, after attracting for a short time a large share of

---

avait pour lui autant de dévouement, je crois, qu'aucun des amis nouveaux, qui sont venus courtiser sa révolte. A ce souvenir je tombe à genoux, offrant pour lui à Dieu des prières, dans lesquelles il n'a plus foi; et je ne me relève que pour combattre *dans l'ami de ma jeunesse l'ennemi de tout ce qui j'aime d'un éternel amour.* (Université cathol., recueil philosoph, scientif. et litt., T. III. et IV., Paris, 1837.) *Abbé Gerbet*, Apostasy from the Vital Principle of the Church and the State, being a Germ. trans. fr. the French, Augsburg, 1839.

[1] *Geramb*, Journey to Rome, p. 50.

[2] *Fr. Kuntsmann*, The Sect of Abbé Châtel (Freiburg Theol. Review, Vol. III., nro. 1, p. 57 sq.) Catéchisme à l'usage de l'église cath. franç. par l'abbé Châtel, Par., 1837. Réforme radicale, Nouvel Eucologe à l'usage de l'église cath., III. ed., Par., 1839. Cf. *Tübing*, Quarterly, 1832, p. 698 sq.

[3] *Saint-Simon*, Lettres d'un habitant à Genève, 1802. Introd. aux travaux scientifiques du 19e siècle, Par., 1807, 2 T., 4to. De la réorganisation de la société europ., 1814. Catéchisme des industriels, Par., 1824. Le Nouveau Christianisme, Par., 1825. Doctrine de Saint-Simon, Par. (1828), éd. 3, 1831, T. I. *Lechevalier*, Enseignement central, Par., 1831. Rel. Saint-Simon association universelle, Paris, 1831. Criticisms

public attention, ceased to exist. Claude Henri, Count de Saint-Simon, the founder of the *Saint-Simonians*, was born in Paris, October 17, 1760. He belonged to a noble and ancient family, was educated in the philosophical principles of the eighteenth century, entered the army when only eighteen, served in the American War of Independence, and distinguished himself on the day of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown. Tiring of the profession of arms, he began to study politics, devoting himself especially to the constitution of the new American Republics. On his return to France he found everything in a state of fermentation, and, while abstaining from openly taking part in the Revolution, he sympathized with its aspirations and approved its aim, believing it to be the beginning of a new era, in which not only the political, but the moral and religious orders would be regenerated. Anxious to contribute what he could towards bringing about so happy a condition of things, he began to dream of reorganizing the sciences and reconstructing the social fabric. Knowing, however, as yet, comparatively little of the sciences, he took a house near the *Ecole Polytechnique*, and invited to his table its professors of mathematics, physics, and astronomy; and, having gained the desired knowledge in these branches, changed his lodgings, and settling down in the neighbourhood of the *Ecole de Médicine*, adopted the same plan with the physiologists, from whom he learned something of the structure of organized bodies. He also travelled in England, Switzerland, and Germany, and, in 1807, during the empire, as one of the competitors for a prize offered by Napoleon, published his *Introduction to the Scientific Works of the Nineteenth Century*, besides many others, all of which were ill received. All his plans miscarried. Driven to despair by financial ruin, he attempted to commit suicide, but only succeeded in putting out one of his eyes; and, two years later, May 29, 1825, died, surrounded by a few of his disciples.

Saint-Simon held that Christianity is a harsh and comfortless religion; that the principle, "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's*," divides men into two unequal classes, and gives rise to an unfair distribution of happiness and misery; that the contrast between the ideal and real life of man, between the world here below and the world beyond the grave, is still more prominently brought out by the appliances of modern industry, by which the earth is changed into a place of sorrow and a vale of tears; that Christianity, having no longer any mission to fulfil, should give room to new forces and to a superior wisdom, capable of putting an end to this contrast, and of securing to man the real happiness his heart yearns for, not alone in the life to come, as promised by the Gospel, but also in the present one; that Protestantism had a negative office to perform, namely, that of destroying Catholicity and dividing the Christian world, and had done its work; and, finally, that to Saint-Simonianism was reserved the positive work of inaugurating the golden age of the *Everlasting Gospel*. The revelation supplied by Saint-Simon, so his disciples claim, embraces at once body and soul, God and the world; combines in one system the spiritual truths of Catholicity and those of materialistic philosophy; and, finally, produces the happiness and eternal brotherhood which Christianity promised, but never realized. Henceforth *all* shall have equal rights in property, which belongs to God, and is held in trust by man; the law of inheritance shall be abolished; and in the course of time there shall be a community of goods. Also, no family shall be exclusively engaged in the tillage of the soil or in the menial services of society; everyone shall receive reward according to his gifts and capacity; society shall be wholly under the control of the ministers of God; and the hierarchy shall consist of priests, theologians, and deacons. In religion the Saint-Simonian form of government shall be theocratic; in unity, monarchical; in talent, virtue, and the merit of its leading members, aristocratical; but, consonantly with its aim, which is the happiness of the greatest number, in whatever is necessary to secure this, democratical.

Even during the lifetime of Saint-Simon his theories were embraced by such eminent men as *Auguste Comte*, the founder of "Positive Philosophy," and *Augustin Thierry*, the celebrated historian; and after his death they found eloquent defenders in Messrs. *Olinde*, *Rodrigues*, *Michael Chevalier*, and *Lherminier*. The means employed to spread the Saint-Simonian Society were incessant preaching, frequent missions, and pamphlets, which poured from the Press without number. It was especially popular among the

---

of this work see in the Tübing. Quart., 1832. Procès en police correctionnelle, Par. 1832. **Moehler*, Saint-Simonism (complete works, Vol. II., pp. 34-53). (Tr).; See also *Saint-Simon*, Sa vie et ses travaux, by *Hubbart*, Paris, 1859. Œuvres choisies de Saint-Simon, published by *Enfantin*, in 3 vols., Brussels, 1859; new ed., Paris, 1861; and complete and joint edition of both Saint-Simon and Enfantin's works, 20 vols., 1865-1869.

working classes of the larger cities, and fell to pieces only when *Father Enfantin*, the Supreme Chief, relinquishing his apostolate among men for the more congenial one among *women*, in whom he professed to discover the most sublime manifestation of the Divinity, began to preach to his devotees, most of whom were married, the doctrine of Mohammedan *polygamy* (1831). This was the beginning of a schism, and Father Rodrigues characterized the teachings of Enfantin as a desertion of the principles of Saint-Simon. Finally, in 1832, when the doctrines of the Saint-Simonians began to give occasion to disturbances among the workingmen of Lyons, their place of meeting was closed, and some of their leaders arrested and punished for misconduct. From this time forth the shame attaching to them was such that they no longer appeared in public. Their writings and works were ridiculed, and most of them abandoned a doctrine which had excited in them only a momentary enthusiasm. The few who remained loyal to their former principles passed over to Egypt to find new fields for energies that had been paralyzed in France. *Mary Reine*, who edited a paper called *La Femme Libre*, now became the leading spirit of the Saint-Simonians, but it would seem that the system did not bring her the comfort and blessings its author promised, for she put an end to her life by casting herself into the Seine, June 29, 1836.

Startled by these alarming symptoms, and possibly desirous to preserve and strengthen its own power and authority, the Government of July effected a reconciliation with the Church, and gave particular attention to the subject of education, to which the clergy devoted themselves with zeal and energy.

The congregations most distinguished at this time for their work in the cause of education were the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, and the *Brothers of St. Joseph*.[1] In 1841 there were 2,136 Brothers and 10,371 Sisters of various congregations engaged in teaching in France, in active and successful competition with lay teachers. The congregations will be *separately* treated hereafter.

By-and-by friendly relations were established between the Government and the clergy, and the latter prudently kept aloof from all interference in politics, devoting their strength and energies to the work of their august ministry. They were remarkable for their earnest zeal, their dignified deportment, and irreproachable morals. Their high moral character extorted the praise of even their enemies. To keep alive and nourish the fervour so necessary to the life of a priest, the *French episcopacy*, embracing many worthy and illustrious names, provided for the holding of yearly retreats and other religious exercises specially adapted to this end. *Jansenism* and *Gallicanism* which had at one time divided the French clergy into hostile camps, now nearly, if not quite, disappeared, and the Government cheerfully assisted in establishing closer relations between the clergy and the Holy See. Their intellectual culture was promoted by two enterprises of almost simultaneous origin. On the one hand, men like Messrs. *Didot*, *Gaume*, *Caillau*, and *Migne*[2] published and sold at a very trifling price the works of the *Fathers of the Church*, the *principal Catholic commentators on Scripture*, and the *great theologians* and

[1] Cf., on the religious establishments of France, *The Catholic* of 1841, Oct., pp. 1, 19; 1842, Jany., pp. 26-46; March, pp. 231, 254.

[2] *Caillau*, Introductio ad SS. Patrum lectionem, Mediolani, 1830, 2 vols. The *Latin* in 217 vols., 4to, Paris, 1843 sq., and the *Greek* Fathers, in 162 vols., 4to, Paris, 1857 sq., published by *Migne*. For *Exegesis* and *Dogmatics*, Sacræ scripturæ et Theologiæ cursus completus ex tractatibus omnium perfectissimis ubique (=quacunque gentium.—Tr.) habitis, etc., 56 vols., 4to, Paris, ed. *Migne*. Cfr. *Hurter*, Birth and Regeneration.

sacred orators, thus encouraging the clergy to give their time to ecclesiastical studies; on the other, eminent scholars, such as Cardinal *Gousset,* Bishop *Dupanloup, Gerbet, Bautain, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Rio, Mercel de Serres, Blanc, Saint-Bonnet, Breyme, Siguier, Védrine, Receveur, Rohrbacher, Glaire, Ginouillac, Ozanam,* and *Nicolas,*[1] by their labours gave to theology a more speculative tendency and erudite character. Ancient Christian literary treasures, the existence of which was hitherto unknown, were brought to light and published by the Benedictine, Father *Pitra,* in his *Specilegium Solesmense* (1852 et sq., 4 vols., 4to). The *Ami de la Religion,* edited by M. *Picot* († 1840); the *Université Catholique,* the *Union Catholique,* the *Univers,* the *Correspondant,* and other religious journals contributed in their way to inspire the clergy with an ardent and persevering energy. The combined result of all these efforts was the notable progress made by religion, chiefly after the Revolution of 1830, which was only partially retarded by the attempts made to overturn both the civil and religious orders.

Nowhere was the revival of religion more remarkable than in Paris; the churches were well attended at all times, but particularly during the season of Advent and on station-days in Lent. Christian speech was once more heard, even in the *French Academy,* where powerful statesmen like *Molé* and *Pasquier* seemed to take a delight and pride in proclaiming their religious convictions.[2] There was, however, one serious cause of regret. *Higher education* in France was wholly controlled by the *University,* and the *philosophy* taught was *godless and materialistic.* The bishops protested against this *monopoly,* and demanded *freedom of education;* the Catholic press reiterated the same protest and the same demand; Count *Montalembert* made a vigorous speech to the same purpose in the French House of Peers; and *Saint-Foi,* adopting a similar line of argument in his *Livre des peuples et des rois,* showed in eloquent and burning words the terrible consequences of apostasy from God, but all to little purpose.[3] Men who had the cry of liberty incessantly upon their tongues, and were dinning it with wearisome iteration into the ears of other men, refused to grant it in matters where it is most vital that men should be free. Those who shout liberty, fraternity, and equality have always been tyrants, once they got power into their own hands. In the meantime, however, the spirit of faith was kept alive and glow-

[1] *The Catholic* of 1843, May nro., pp. 113-137, and Thesaurus libror. rei Catholicæ, Würzburg, 1848, under the respective names. *Nicolas,* The Relation of Protestantism and of all Heresies to Socialism; Germ. by *Müller,* Mentz, 1853.

[2] *The Catholic,* Mentz, 1841, Febr. nro., Append., p. L. sq. Cf. June nro., Appendix; *ibid.,* Febr. nro. of 1843.

[3] *The Catholic* of 1841 and 1842. Le monopole universitaire, destructeur de la Religion et des Lois, ou la Charte et la liberté de l'enseignement, Lyon, 1843. *Lamartine,* The Freedom of Instruction (*The Catholic,* 1844, nro. 1, Appendix; nro. 10, Appendix, 2; see also nro. 9). *Montalembert,* in the Chamber of Peers (*The Catholic,* May, 1844). *Staudenmaier,* The Chief Point in the Question of Public Instruction in France (*Freiburg Journal* of Theol., Vol. XIII.) *Bonn Review* of Philos. and Theol., new series, year V.-nros. 3 and 4.

ing by pulpit orators like *Rozaven*, *Ravignan*, *Lacordaire*, and *Bautain*, and by numerous and accurate editions of the Holy Scriptures, the Following of Christ, prayer-books, and the works of Bossuet, Fénélon, Massillon, Bourdaloue, and other eminent authors. That it was a living and sustained faith is evident from the contributions made by the French to the support of *Foreign Missions*,[1] greater in amount than the contributions of all other nations for the same purpose put together; from the number and character of the *charitable institutions* which it inspired, among which may be mentioned the Societies of *St. Francis Regis* and of *St. Vincent de Paul* and the *Sunday Schools* for workingmen;[2] from the universal admiration and esteem expressed for the *Sisters of Charity*, under whose charge nearly all the hospitals and central prison houses of correction were placed;[3] and, finally, from the greater interest in providing for the religious wants of the *Catholic soldiers*, particularly in the colonies, and from the erection of a new *bishopric in Algiers*, a very important step for the future of the Church in that country.

§ 401. *The Catholic Church in Spain.*

On his return to his States, Ferdinand VII. set aside the Constitution of the Cortes (1814), it being hostile to the Church, and restored the ancient order of things. Unfortunately the country was separated into two camps: in the one were the *Apostolicals*, or defenders of the rights of the Church; in the other the *Liberals*, or those professing to be the champions of freedom. The latter gained the day, and on the 7th of March, 1821, forced the king to accept a new Constitution. Two years later there was an uprising of the royalists, and, aided by French intervention, they restored the authority of Ferdinand. It was now the turn of the advocates of the Constitution to have some experience of the persecution they inflicted on others in the day of their power. But the king was by no means ready to adopt all the views of the Apostolicals; like his Bourbon predecessors, he believed the proper form of Government was an absolute monarchy. The Apostolicals were discontented, and meditated his overthrow and the placing of *Don Carlos* upon the throne. This gave rise to troubles in Catalonia, which, however, were soon suppressed.

[1] Annales de la propagation de la foi (Germ. by *Ritter*) (*Smets*), publ. at Cologne and Our Lady of Hermits. We mention, besides, L'Œuvre du Catholicisme en Europe. Cf. Cath. Eccl. Gazette, year 1840, nro. 1, and the *Tübing.* Quart., year 1839, nro. 3, pp. 367 381.

[2] Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, rapport général de l'année 1843, Paris, 1844; conférences de Paris, ibid., 1844. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. X.; *The Catholic*, 1843, Appendix of February number.

[3] According to the *Constitutionnel* of December 14, 1843, there were then in France 1,329 hospitals for the sick and the poor; 6,276 charity-boards, supplying aid to 695,932 persons; the religious congregations of women took care of 1,200,000 sick persons, besides furnishing 10,375 teachers, who had under their charge 620,950 children; the Brothers of Christian Doctrine numbered 2,136, and were educating 150,000 pupils; moreover, they were daily increasing in number. (Note of French Tr.)

As time went on, the estrangement between Ferdinand and the Apostolicals became more complete. After the death of Josephine, his third wife, he married his cousin, *Maria Christina*, of Naples, December 11, 1829, through whose influence he abrogated, by a decree of March 29, 1830, the Salic law, excluding females from the throne, which the European powers had forced upon Spain by the Peace of *Utrecht* (1713), to prevent a union by marriage of the French and Spanish crowns. The old Castilian law of succession was thus revived, giving to the king's daughters and grand-daughters a priority of right before his brothers and other collateral lines. On the 10th of October, 1830, an heir was born to the king, who had had no issue by his former marriages, in the person of *Isabella*, who, on the death of her father, September 29, 1833, was proclaimed Queen of Spain. Her mother, Christina, was named regent, and Don Carlos, the brother of the late king, with many of his adherents, was ordered to quit the kingdom. This was the occasion of a fresh civil war, which raged with great violence in Aragon and the Basque Provinces; and the queen-regent, being now entirely in the power of the Liberals, could maintain herself only by making every day new concessions. To add to the general disorder, the cholera broke out in Madrid in 1834, and a rumour was started and sped like fire through the city that the monks had poisoned the wells. A furious mob at once rushed to the monasteries, forcibly entered them, and murdered their peaceful inmates.[1] Every hour added to the confusion, and the spirit of irreligion grew daily more impious and aggressive. The most infamous works that French literature could supply were translated into Spanish, and a fierce and multitudinous clamour was raised against convents and persons of religious profession. By a law of June 25, 1835, nine hundred convents were suppressed, their property confiscated, and, together with that belonging to the Inquisition, confiscated some time previously, sold to pay the public debt. On the 15th of August, 1835, an insurrection broke out at Madrid; the restoration of the Constitution of 1812 was demanded; and the Deputies repaired to Aranjuez, and required the queen-regent to give her consent to the suppression of the remaining monasteries. By the adroitness of the minister, the measure was for the present delayed, but under *Mendizabal*, his successor, carried into execution, in virtue of a decree of October 11, 1835. By this decree three thousand monasteries, that is, nearly all there were in the kingdom, were suppressed; their books, pictures, art treasures of every kind, and everything else of value, including the sacred vessels, seized and sold at a price far below their worth, to cover the expenses of the civil war between the *Christinos* or Constitutionalists and the Royalists or *Carlists*.[2] Following the example of the French National Convention, the Cortes, in 1837, abolished tithes, and declared the posses-

1 Cfr. *Sion*, year 1841, nro. 128, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 488 sq.
2 *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 294 sq.; Vol. IV., p. 641 sq., 705 sq.

sions of the Church national property. A committee was at the same time appointed to draw up a plan for the *reformation and reorganization of the clergy*. It consisted of ecclesiastics of known Jansenistic tendencies and favourable to episcopal independence of the Holy See. They proposed the suppression of seventeen old bishoprics and the erection of five new ones, the closing of eighteen cathedral churches, and the maintenance of worship and the support of the clergy at the public expense. By the Constitution of 1837 (Art. XI.) the Government had already pledged itself to provide out of the public treasury for the worship and the priests of the *Catholic* Church, to which the great bulk of the Spanish people belonged.

Desirous to be at once impartial and to consult for the best interests of the Church, *Gregory XVI.* declined, during the continuance of the civil war, either to recognize Queen Isabella or to utter a word against the new order of things. Many of the clergy, however, possessing neither his foresight nor his elevated ideas of justice, declared emphatically in favour of Don Carlos, and as a consequence of their rashness many dioceses remained without pastors; monks and other religious were thrown out of their annuities; and even priests in charge of congregations were reduced to the extremities of want. On the other hand, the Government made appointments to archbishoprics, to whom the Holy See declined to grant canonical institution; and, while the question was still in dispute, caused the appointees to be chosen administrators of the dioceses by the respective chapters. During the ministry of Count *Ofalia*, when it finally became evident that something must be done to improve the deplorable condition of the Church, a committee was appointed to deliberate upon the best means of again establishing relations between the Spanish Government and the Holy See. *Don Julian Villalba* was sent as envoy to Rome, and besides being very active himself, received also important aid from the French court in prosecuting the object of his mission. As there were now twenty-two sees vacant in Spain and her dependencies,[1] the necessity was urgent of coming to some understanding immediately.

After the conference at Vergara between *Espartero* and *Maroto* the civil war gradually died out. Worn out by the severe trials through which they had just passed, the Spaniards turned with fresh relish to thoughts of God and his Church. With the return of peace came also a revival of faith and a more assiduous attention to religious duties. Numerous journals were started in the interests of Church and State, of which *La Religion*, *El Catolico*, and *El Profeta* were the best known and most influential. But, unfortunately, fresh troubles and new dangers surrounded the Church after the Revolution of 1840, which resulted in the forcible resignation by Queen Christina of her office of regent.

The revolutionary juntas in the provinces were extremely violent

[1] Conf. *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of 1840, nros. 27 and 45; also *Augsburg Universal Gazette*, year 1840, nro. 222.

in their treatment of ecclesiastics. Bishops were expelled from their dioceses and priests from their parishes, and their places supplied by members of the so-called liberal clergy. The junta of Madrid even went the length of suspending the Assessors of the Ecclesiastical Tribunal (*Rota de la Nunciatura Apostolica*), established March 26, 1771, during the Pontificate of Clement XIV. *Ramirez de Arellano*, the Papal Nuncio, was conducted across the frontier by order of the provisional government of Espartero, December 29, 1840, because he protested in the name of the Holy See against these acts of violence and all infringements of the rights of the Church. On the 1st of February, 1836, the *Holy Father*, Gregory XVI., delivered an *allocution*, and *another* on the 1st of March, 1841, in both of which he protested solemnly before God against the outrages heaped upon the Church by the Spanish Government, which had now grown more fiercely hostile than ever to the Court of Rome.[1]

In reply to the second allocution of the Pope, the Spanish revolutionary Government published a manifesto, bearing date of July 30, shamelessly misrepresenting the character of the papal document, which was purely religious, and professing to regard it as a *declaration of war*, emanating, not from the Head of the Church, but from the temporal ruler of Rome, and on this account offensive to the Spanish people, who were not prepared to remain quiet under such gratuitous insults. Accordingly, such of the ecclesiastics as attempted to spread the allocution were severely punished. Finally, as if to make the bondage of the Church complete and irrevocable, *Alonso*, Minister of Justice and Grace, renewed the oft-tried experiment *of severing the bonds uniting Head and members* by forcibly putting bishops appointed by Government in possession of sees without the authorization of Rome. But against this assumption of spiritual power even the liberal bishops themselves protested, and were in consequence deposed, and expiated in exile the penalty of their boldness. Gregory XVI. now addressed an encyclical letter to the whole Church, calling upon the faithful *to offer public prayers for the welfare of the Church in Spain*.[2] All Christendom cheerfully responded to the summons of the Holy Father, and though borne down with sorrow that evils so great should afflict the venerable Church of Spain, was not without hope that a nation, which had been distinguished of old for its ardent piety, had triumphed over Islamism and repelled Protestantism from its borders, would come safe out of its present dangers, cast off the blight of infidelity, and be as glorious in the future as it had been in the past. And, in matter of fact, there were signs plainly indicating that these prayers were not without effect. Sees were filled with bishops possessed of

[1] *Sion*, year 1841, March, nro. 31; the answer of the Spanish minister, *ibid.*, August, nro. 98, Appendix. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., p. 467-471. The preliminary ordinance of the Spanish Government, dated July 28, referring to the allocution, is found in *Sion*, July, nro. 84. Concerning the sale of clerical property, see *Sion*, 1841, August, nro. 108, Appendix, and September, nro. 118, Appendix.

[2] The Latin text is given in the April number of *The Catholic* of 1842, supplement., p. XVI. sq. The Spanish also attempted to prevent the execution of this encyclical.

apostolic courage, and writers of eminent ability, like *Balmes*[1] (b. 1810, d. 1848), and great Christian statesmen, like *Donoso Cortes*, Marquis de Valdegamas (b. May 6, 1809, d. May 3, 1853),[2] began to take their place among the champions of the Church. "We feel assured," said the organs of the better class of the people, "that the Church, in emerging from these difficulties, will have gained immensely. You cry freedom," they said, addressing their opponents, "and you do well. Freedom is what we demand both for ourselves and for the Church. The Catholic religion is a sacred law, engraven upon the tablets of our national liberties. In our faith and its divine power we will seek the strength necessary to enable us to persevere in the work of maintaining our independence, against the horrors of which we are now the witnesses." "Look to it," they added, appealing to the younger clergy, "look to it, you of the rising generation of priests, for the age is in your keeping, since it is the duty of youth in seasons of convulsions to hand on to the future the sacred traditions of the past. And as the hopes of the future are centred in you, learn wisdom at the foot of the crucifix, that under the protection of a faith ever old and ever new, peace and happiness may again rest upon our common country.

The persecutors were soon overtaken in their career of iniquity. The ministry were overthrown; Espartero banished; and *Isabella II.* declared of age, called to take the reins of Government into her own hands (Nov. 10, 1843). The new administration signalized its accession to power by some acts of justice to the Church. Bishops were recalled from exile, the restrictions on the exercise of their authority removed,[3] and the *Rota de la Nunciatura Apostolica* again established, but no steps were taken to restore the confiscated property of the

[1] The principal of the numerous works of Rev. *B. Jaime Balmes*, a writer equally great as a statesman, philosopher, and theologian, which have often been republished and translated into French, German, English, Italian, &c., are: Observaciones sociales, politicas y economicas sobre los bienos del clero, written about 1837 against sacrilegious confiscation; Consideraciones sobre la situacion de España, directed chiefly against Espartero; El Protestantismo comparado con el Catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilizacion europea (Barcelona, 1842-1844; Paris, 1844-1853; Engl. tr., Baltimore, 1851), which established his fame beyond the Pyrenees; Cartas a un esceptico, i. e., Letters to a Sceptic; La religion demostrada ad alcance de los niños, which is a very popular catechism; El Criterio; Filosofia fundamental, 4 vols., Barcelona, 1846, his chief work, translated into English by H. F. Brownson, 2 vols., New York, 1857; Filosofia elemental, a practical text-book, tr. into Latin by the author himself; Escritos politicos, in a strong 4to vol., published after his death; the periodicals La Civilizacion, later on merged in the Sociedad; El Pensamiento de la Nacion, and the pamphlet "Pio IX." This model priest and modern teacher of the Spanish nation, deeply imbued with the spirit of St. Thomas, had a square named after him and a statue erected to his memory at *Vich*, his native city. (Tr.)

[2] *Donoso Cortés*, in the most famous of his works, Essai sur le Catholicisme, le libéralisme et le socialisme (Paris, 1851), maintains that Catholic theology is the proper basis of politics. Of his other writings, we may mention Consideraciones sobre la diplomacia, y su influencia en el estado politico y social de Europa (Madrid, 1834); La ley electoral, considerada en su base y en su relacion con el espiritu de nuestras instituciones (1835); and a collection of his speeches and early writings (1849-1850). A complete Spanish edition of his works was published after his death at Madrid, and the same appeared in a French dress at Paris in 1859. (Tr.)

[3] See *The Catholic* of 1844, nro. 15, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIV., p. 209 sq.

Church. After many and tedious negotiations, the queen finally announced, at the opening of the Cortes in December, 1848, that relations with the Holy See were once more established and all ecclesiastical matters satisfactorily adjusted.

§ 402. *The Catholic Church in Portugal.*

On the death of *Maria*, March 26, 1816, her son, *John VI.*, succeeded to the crown of Portugal. Being then in Brazil, whither he had gone after the expulsion of the French from Portugal, he entrusted the government of his European dominions conjointly to Lord Beresford and the Patriarch of Lisbon. The country being in the meantime occupied by the English, the Portuguese rose in rebellion against the rule of strangers, and at Lisbon and Oporto demanded their removal and the formation of juntas (1820). The Cortes were convoked, and proclaimed a constitution still more democratic in character than that already adopted in Spain. To this constitution John VI., who had finally concluded to visit his European possessions, was forced to swear fidelity, October 1, 1822, after his arrival at Lisbon. When, however, the government of the Cortes was overthrown in Spain, a similar reaction against the constitution took place in Portugal. *Queen Carlotta*, a sister to Ferdinand VII., and Prince *Dom Miguel*, laboured strenuously for the restoration of royal authority, and in consequence of an uprising, which took place May 27, 1823, and was participated in by both the people and the army, the king was enabled to abrogate the constitution. Knowing the weakness and indecision of his father, Dom Miguel now headed a rebellion against him, but being defeated April 23, 1824, was, together with his mother, expelled the kingdom. John VI. died March 10, 1826. The heir presumptive to the throne was his eldest son, *Dom Pedro*, who, having remained in Brazil after the departure of the royal family for Spain, had proclaimed that country an independent empire in 1822, and assumed the title of *Emperor of Brazil*. Unable at once to take the direction of affairs in Portugal, he entrusted the government of that country to his daughter, *Doña Maria da Gloria*, then in her seventeenth year, with his sister, Isabella Maria, as regent, who was compelled to accept a charter modelled upon that of France. The hand of the Infanta was offered by her father, Dom Pedro, to Dom Miguel, who was appointed regent, July 3, 1827, and took the oath to maintain the constitution, February 26, 1828. Dom Miguel now aspired to the throne, and, after defeating the garrison of Oporto and others that remained loyal to Dom Pedro, and imprisoning or exiling such of the deputies as he foresaw would oppose his pretensions, convoked the Cortes, and was proclaimed king by that body, June 25, 1828. To consolidate his power, he had recourse to the most arbitrary measures, and his Government was so despotic that the liberal party rose in revolt against it. This was the commencement of a war that lasted through the years 1832, 1833.

and 1834, between Dom Miguel and his elder brother, Dom Pedro I., who, having abdicated the imperial throne of Brazil in 1831, sailed in June, 1832, for Portugal, with a fleet and a considerable body of troops, collected on the island of Terceira, one of the Azores, to make good the claim of his daughter to the throne of Portugal.

Dom Miguel, having defended the rights of the Church against the Cortes and opposed the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, had the sympathies of both clergy and people. *Dom Pedro*, on the other hand, proclaimed himself the champion of freedom and the vindicator of his daughter's right to the throne, and, with the aid of the French and English, was victorious in the struggle. Abandoned by the bulk of his followers, and seeing the hopelessness of longer continuing the conflict, Dom Miguel signed the Convention of Evora on May 3, 1834, by which he resigned all pretensions to the Crown, and agreed to quit Portugal. He went first to Genoa, thence to Rome, and subsequently passed several years in London. In 1851 he married the German Princess Loewenstein, by whom he had one son, Miguel, born in 1853, and four daughters. He died November 14, 1866, at Wertheim, in the Grand Duchy of Baden.

The Church in Portugal seemed now to be again passing through the disastrous *days of Pombal*. By a decree of August 5, 1833, Dom Pedro declared all bishoprics vacant to which appointments had been made by the Holy See on the presentation of Dom Miguel; and by another of May 28, 1834, the Religious and Military Orders were suppressed, their hospitals closed, and their property confiscated; tithes were abolished, and the parish priests, to whom the Government refused to pay the promised salaries, were reduced to utter destitution, and forced to subsist upon the charity of the faithful. By an *allocution* of August 1, 1834, the Pope, after deploring the sad condition of religious affairs in Portugal, threatened with the censures, pronounced by the Council of Trent against the spoilers of the Church, all who violated the ecclesiastical liberties and interfered with the free exercise of spiritual authority.[1] His words, however, did not deter the Patriarch of Lisbon from consecrating the bishops appointed by Dom Pedro.

Dom Pedro died September 24, 1834, and after the accession of his daughter, *Doña Maria da Gloria*, to the throne, the Government passed almost completely under English influence. A new constitution was proclaimed, which, though it was only indifferently received by the people, contributed largely to complicate the religious difficulties of Portugal. Quite a numerous party refused to acknowledge as lawful bishops those appointed by Dom Pedro, without the authorization of the Sovereign Pontiff. Negotiations were opened at Lisbon in 1841 between the Holy See and the Portuguese Court, through the internuncio, *Cappacini*, by whose ability and address amicable relations were again restored. As a preliminary condition to a future

[1] The Latin original is in *The Catholic*, 1834, Oct. Supplem., p. VIII. sq.

concordat, Cappacini was obliged to relinquish the Church's claim to the property formerly belonging to the Religious Orders. On the 3rd of April, 1843, the papal confirmation was obtained for the appointments made by the queen, viz., the Patriarch of Lisbon, the Archbishop of Braga, and the Bishop of Leiria, the others being held over for future consideration by Cappacini.[1] Everything now seemed to indicate that the conclusion of the concordat was not far off; but, notwithstanding the prudence and conciliatory temper displayed by both the Holy Father and his internuncios, final action was indefinitely deferred, and this unsatisfactory state of affairs endures to the present day. On the death of the queen, on the 15th of November, 1853, Dom Pedro succeeded to the throne, under the regency of his father, the king-consort, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, who governed the kingdom until the expiration of the prince's minority, on September 15, 1855. He appears to have exercised his authority with prudence and discretion, and since his time the royal family has been steadily growing in public favour, and on the whole the condition of the country is now more promising. The death of the young king and his brother John, in 1861, seems to have evoked feelings of loyalty and sympathy throughout the nation, and the present sovereign, Louis I., second son of Doña Maria, was proclaimed amid universal expressions of attachment to the reigning dynasty. Still, owing to the intolerant spirit of the liberal party, whose leaders are at the head of the Government, there has been no material improvement in the affairs of the Church.

§ 403. *The New Birth of the Church in Great Britain and Ireland.* (Cf. § 329.)

†Discussion amicale sur l'église anglicane et en général sur la Réforme, dediée au clergé de toutes les communions protestantes, redigée en forme de lettres, par M. l'évêque de Strasbourg (le Pape de Trévern); 4th edition, Paris, 1835, 2 vols. Cfr. † *Weber*, State of Religion in England. *Pletz*, New Theolog. Review, year XIII., nro. 4. *Scharpff*, nro. 2, pp. 251-291. Organization of the Catholic Church in England (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. LIII., year 1864, in five articles). *R. Murray*, Ireland and her Church, London, 1848. *Shea*, The Irish Church, London, 1852. *De Beaumont*, L'Irlande, Paris, 1839. See "The Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell," by his son, *John O'Connell*, M.P. (2 vols., London, 1846). "The Liberator, his Life and Times," by *L. F. Cusack* (London, 1872). Abbé *Perraud*, Etudes sur l'Irlande contemporaine (Paris, 1862).

As has been seen, the oppressive laws restricting the liberties of the Catholics of Great Britain, and notably of *Ireland*, began to be somewhat relaxed about the time of the French Revolution, which drove numerous priests beyond the Channel,[2] whose piety, ability,

[1] Augsburg *Univ. Gazette*, 1843, nro. 127. *Ibid.*, nro. 37, 1844. Supplem.

[2] During the months of September and October, 1792, 6,000 priests arrived in England, and the number was soon increased to 8,000. The palace of Winchester was placed at their disposal by the royal family, and there 660 of them were most hospitably entertained. A subscription for them was started in the month of September, 1793, and the sum of £67,000 raised, which was ample for the support of 4,800 of the refugees.

and learning largely contributed to correct a host of prejudices. Previously to this time, however, their yoke was rendered more easy and endurable by the circumstances attending the breaking out of the War of Independence in the United States, and the loss to England of her colonies in that country.

By request of George III., the Irish Parliament passed the Relief Act of 1793, granting a few concessions to the Catholics of Ireland. They were now permitted to freely assist at divine service in their own churches; exempted from the penalties for non-attendance at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays; granted freedom of franchise in municipal and parliamentary elections; and allowed to hold a few of the less important civil and military offices.[1] From the higher offices they were still excluded, and in the following year the Catholics of Dublin made another demand for the removal of their remaining disabilities. At the same time a Protestant revolutionary party, known as the United Irishmen, was formed, into which many Catholics entered, either compelled by force or in the belief that through its agency they would soon obtain their civil rights. The Rebellion broke out in 1798, and resulted in the loss to Ireland of her political independence. The Union was effected in 1801, and Ireland has been ever since united to England. After many fruitless attempts to emancipate themselves from their disabilities, the most important of which was the one that ended so disastrously to *Robert Emmet* in 1803, the Catholics of Ireland, finally, in 1809, accepted the leadership of *Daniel O'Connell*, by whose courage, perseverance, skill, and ability the people, while remaining within the strict letter of the law, were kept in a perpetual state of agitation. While O'Connell desired nothing more ardently than the social, political, and religious amelioration of Ireland, he laid it down as a principle that this was to be obtained without the shedding of a single drop of blood.[2] "*Catholic Committees*" were appointed and meetings held all over the island, the avowed purpose of which was to emancipate Catholics from the disabilities under which they lay, and to repeal the Act of Union. The outrages perpetrated by Orangemen served to stimulate thezeal of the agitators. For more than twenty years the subject of emancipation had been uppermost in the minds of Catholics, and in the interval the bills introduced into the English Houses of Parliament for the purpose of abolishing the disqualifying statutes had been uniformly thrown out.[3] And now that there seemed a fairer opportunity than ever before of having a Relief Bill passed, it was again temporarily postponed by the controversy between the Catholics of England and Ireland on the

[1] *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Vol. II., p. 354. (Tr.)

[2] *Wyse*, Hist. of the Cath. Association, London, 1829, 2 vols. *Baumstark*, D. O'Connell, Freiburg, 1873.

[3] As early as 1812, Mr. Canning had supported the Relief Bill brought in by Mr. Grattan. It passed the House of Commons by a vote of 255 to 106, but was lost in the House of Lords, the vote standing 126 to 125. (Tr.)

question of giving the Crown the power of *veto* in the appointment of bishops, because on the solution of this question the passage of the bill depended. The *Catholic Committees* were suppressed by Government in 1814, but the *Catholic Association*, having precisely the same object in view, was started, in 1823, by Mr. O'Connell, assisted by Mr. Shiel. This was in its turn declared illegal by Parliament in 1825, and was in consequence dissolved, but only to be replaced by another of the same character, under the name of an *Association for Instruction*.[1] Meetings were held in every province, and petitions drafted and presented to Parliament. These associations were useful in bringing the claims of the Irish Catholics, nearly all of whom were members of them, before the world, and thus pressing them upon the consideration of the Government. In consequence, a Relief Bill was introduced in the House of Commons in March, 1826, and passed that body by a respectable majority. In the House of Lords, however, it met with a most decided and stubborn resistance, which Mr. Bright[2] characterizes as "verging upon the unconstitutional," and was rejected chiefly through the efforts of the Duke of York, by a majority of forty-eight. The matter was brought to a crisis by the return of Mr. O'Connell, now styled the *Liberator*, as member of parliament for Clare, in 1828. During the ministry of Mr. Canning, who was known to be favourable to Catholic Emancipation, the excitement in Ireland had somewhat subsided; but when the Duke of Wellington was called to the Premiership, his undisguised hostility to the measure again revived the agitation. It now became evident to both the premier and his colleague in the ministry, Sir Robert Peel, that they must take their choice between a civil war and the emancipation of the Catholics. After overcoming the difficulty of obtaining the king's consent to the measure, Mr. Peel introduced the bill in the House of Commons, March 5, 1829, where it was finally passed by a vote of 315 to 137. It passed the House of Lords, April 10, by a vote of 213 to 209, and was signed by the king, after some vain and childish attempts to deny that he had freely authorized his minister to bring it in, on the following 13th of April, and now the Catholics, both in England and Ireland, were once more in the enjoyment of very nearly all the rights possessed by their Protestant neighbours.[3] By this bill a new oath, which Catholics might con-

[1] *Baumstark*, L. c., p. 66 sq.

[2] *Rev. J. Franck Bright*, English History, London, 1877, Period III., pp. 1390, 1391. (Tr.)

[3] By this bill Catholics were "eligible to all offices, civil, military, or municipal, with the exception of the office of Regent, of Lord Chancellor, of Viceroy of Ireland, or Royal Commissioner of the General Assembly of Scotland." *Bright*, L. c., Period III., p. 1402 sq. (Tr.) Very complete accounts of the various phases of Catholic Emancipation in Ireland, from 1824 to 1829, are found in *The Catholic* of Mentz, year 1825, Vol. XVI., Supplem. to June number; Vol. XVII., p. 176 sq., year 1829; Vol. XXXII., p. 201 sq., p. 330 sq., together with *Sir Robert Peel's* Speech, unabridged. *Robiano*, T. IV., pp. 176-200. *Theiner*, Collection of some Important Documents bearing on the History of Catholic Emancipation in England, Mentz, 1835.

sistently take, was substituted for the old test oath ;[1] and Catholics were qualified to sit in either House of Parliament, and to hold all civil, military, and municipal offices, with a few important exceptions. The Catholics of these countries, said *Lord John Russell*, felt, in 1829, very like the early Christians when they came forth from the Catacombs. This *first* concession, which a Protestant Government had very reluctantly granted, proved quite insufficient to satisfy the demands of the Catholics of Ireland, who, as Lord *Russell* said in his place in Parliament, had been removed from an underground prison only to be placed in one above ground. Was it reasonable to expect them to be satisfied when 700,000 Anglicans, or about one-tenth of the population, were still in possession of all the property, which in early times had been set apart by the generous liberality of the Catholic faithful for the support of churches, convents, hospitals, and colleges? Nay, more, when Catholics were forced to pay to the clergy of the Established Church *tithes* on all their lands produced, and when two thousand parsons, some of whom had not a single soul under their charge, divided among them a yearly revenue thus accumulated, amounting to three millions of pounds sterling?[2] The result was that in 1831 a *general movement* was set on foot *against the payment of tithes*. Though persistently claimed, they were stubbornly refused, and, when collected at all, their collection was accompanied by so much litigation, and not unfrequently by such shocking scenes of bloodshed, that the profit derived scarcely compensated for the cost and danger of collection.

During the course of these public events the enthusiasm of the Irish people for the faith of their fathers was steadily on the increase, and their patriotic feelings partook of the nature of transport when O'Connell began to agitate for the *Repeal of the Union*. By the Government their patriotic demonstrations were denounced as calculated to foment hatred and incite to rebellion. In 1843, the agitation for the Repeal of the Union was at its height, monster meetings were held in every part of the country, and preparations were being made for one of unusual magnitude, to take place at *Clontarf*, on Sunday, October 8, when instructions were received from Government forbidding it. In 1844, O'Connell, with some of his colleagues, was tried by a jury of twelve Protestants from Dublin, found guilty of seditious conspiracy, fined £2,000, sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and put under bonds to keep the peace for a period of seven years. Even fair-minded Englishmen regarded the sentence as unjust, and it was in consequence reversed by the English House of Lords.[3]

[1] This oath was repealed in 1867, and one still more acceptable substituted. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 434, note. (Tr.)

[2] In the county of Kilkenny, in the south of Ireland, there were 380,000 Catholics and 1,000 Anglicans ; still the former were forced to pay an Anglican bishop and sixty-four ministers a sum which made their income, in *legal tithes*, equal to *six times* that received by the Catholic clergy through voluntary contributions. (*The Catholic*, 1831, Vol. XLI., pp. 57-81 ; *Cologne Gazette*, June 23, 1843.)

[3] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII. †*Rintel*, O'Connell's Trial, Münster, 1845.

Not long after these events O'Connell's health began to break, and being advised to try a milder climate, he set off in the spring of 1847 for Italy, but got no farther than Genoa, where he was taken with paralysis, and died on the 15th of May of the same year.

It may seem strange that Catholics and Catholic institutions were as heartily despised and as fiercely proscribed in *England*, whose special boast is that she is pre-eminently the land of political freedom, as they were even in Ireland. Two circumstances will in a measure account for this condition of things. On the one hand, the Catholics in England were too few in number and too destitute of wealth and influence to provide organs for bringing their claims before the public in any effective way; and, on the other, their political debasement had been such as to render them more indifferent than the Catholics of other countries to the interests of religion. From the days of Henry VIII. to the date of the Emancipation Bill, the *Catholic Press* had been muzzled, or had ceased to exist, and Catholics themselves had been shut out from public life by civil disabilities. They were therefore the victims at once of political proscription and of the unjust prejudices accumulated through centuries of ignorance. Hence, when the Press became again free, and the teachings and institutions of the Roman Catholic Church were once more made the subject of public and daily discussion, prejudices began to wear away, and juster judgments and more kindly feelings to prevail. To the influence of the Press is undoubtedly to be ascribed that remarkable movement in favour of the Church of Rome, which set in above forty years ago and continues to our own day.

Previously to this time, however, the apologist, *Gother*,[1] and *Challoner*,[2] Vicar-Apostolic of London, from 1758 to 1781, dissipated by their numerous writings, at least among honest and fair-minded men, the prejudices current against Catholics. The Catholic cause was also ably and zealously defended by *Alban Butler*, the author of the *Lives of the Saints;* by *John Milner*,[3] Vicar-Apostolic of the

[1] *J. Gother*, The Papist Misrepresented and Represented, Cincinnati, 1 vol.

[2] Bishop *Challoner's* edition of the Holy Bible, 5 vols., 12mo, ed. 1750, superseded the Douai edition; reprinted, New York, 1870. His "Think Well On't," "Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine," "History of the Protestant Religion," "Catholic Christian Instructed," "Meditations," "Lives of the Fathers of the Desert," "Garden of the Soul: a Manual of Prayers," and his translations of "The Following of Christ," and "The Introduction to a Devout Life," have been reprinted frequently in England, Ireland, and America. His "Memoirs of the Missionary Priests," &c., has been several times reprinted. Among his other works were, "Britannia Sancta" (2 vols., 4to), "Unerring Authority of the Cath. Church," "British Martyrology," and a "Caveat against the Methodists." (Tr.)

[3] Bishop *Jno. Milner* wrote "Letters to a Prebendary," Dr. Sturges (1800); "End of Religious Controversy" (1818); "Correspondence between a Society of Protestants and some Catholic Divines." *E. Baines* († 1843), Defence of the Christian Religion, London, 1825. *J. Fletcher*, "The Guide to the True Religion," "Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches," "Difficulties of Protestanism," "Reflections on the Spirit of Religious Controversy," "Vindication of the Catholic Faith." *Howard*, Remarks on the Erroneous Notions entertained Respective of the Catholic Religion. *Coombe*, Essence of Religious Controversy. *Jos. Berington* († 1827), with Dr. *Kirk* († 1851), published, in 1813, "The Faith of Catholics."

Midland District, from 1803 to 1828; by *Baines* and *Fletcher; Howard* and *Berington*, and *Kirk* and *Coombe*. *William Cobbett*, the author of the *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*, possessing a thorough and extensive knowledge of the facts of which he was treating, exposed with consummate skill and great vivacity of style the vulnerable side of Protestantism, and denounced before all Europe, in strong and energetic language, the wrongs which Catholics had been made to endure. *Mr. Robert Charles Dallas*, an Anglican, in a work entitled *The New Conspiracy against the Jesuits* (1815), warmly defended that body against the calumnies put in circulation against them.

Rev. *John Lingard* († 1851), the eminent writer and scholar, published a History of England, in which depth of research, impartiality of treatment, and independence of judgment are so conspicuous as to render his statements nearly if not quite unassailable.[1] Lord *Macaulay*, though a Protestant, wrote in a spirit of fairness of the Catholic Church. *Lanigan*, Librarian to the Irish Historical Society, published an ecclesiastical history of Ireland down to the thirteenth century; *John MacHale*, the present Archbishop of Tuam, published, in 1827, the *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Religion*, which was almost immediately translated into French and German; *Thomas Moore*, the friend of Lord Byron, wrote the *Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion*, which appeared in 1833; Cardinal *Wiseman* († 1865)[2] gave to the world, in language at once eloquent and popular, a clear and methodical exposition of Catholic doctrine and worship; and Miss *Agnew*, through her celebrated novel, entitled *Geraldine*,[3] was instrumental in attracting many souls to the Catholic Church. *Sir Kenelm Henry Digby*, a convert to Catholicity, after long and laborious archæological studies in the various countries of Europe, published the result of his researches anonymously in London, in three volumes, between the years 1844 and 1847, under the title of *Mores Catholici*, or *Ages of Faith*, a work in which he shows the progress made by the Catholic Church in science, art, and civilization during the Middle Ages. In 1851 the same author published a second work, in six volumes, entitled the *Compitum;* or, the *Meeting of the Ways at the Catholic Church*. The part taken by *periodical literature* in this movement and its influence in leading men's minds back to ideas so long and so rigorously proscribed was both considerable and

[1] Life of *Dr. Lingard*, *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, pp. 100-115.

[2] Horæ Syriacæ (publ. 1828), Sterility of Protestant Missions (Ital.), Rome, 1831. Lectures on the Connection of Science and Revealed Religion (2 vols., 1836); Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church (2 vols., 1836); The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Eucharist (1836); Four Lectures on the Ceremonies of Holy Week (1839); Essays on Various Subjects (3 vols., 1853); Fabiola; or, the Church of the Catacombs (1855); Recollections of the Last Four Popes (1858); Sermons (2 vols., 1864); Daily Meditations, Dublin, 1868, &c.

[3] *Geraldine*, or the History of the Guidance of a Soul, London, 1837, directed against the errors attributed to the Catholic Church and the insults heaped upon her ministers, in the *Abbot* of Sir Walter Scott and in Sir Henry Bulwer Lytton s *Devereux*.

important. Among the best known and most serviceable of these publications were the *Catholic Magazine* and *Tablet*, the latter edited by Mr. Lucas, formerly a Quaker. The London Catholic *Tract Society* also contributed largely to the progress of the movement, which received a fresh stimulus from the publication, in the year 1826, of the *Declaration* of the Vicars-Apostolic and their Coadjutors,[1] who at that time governed the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain with episcopal authority. This important document, which consists of eleven articles, gives a scholarly and forcible exposition of the doctrines most frequently and most warmly assailed by Protestants. Beginning with a general statement of the doctrine of the Catholic Church, it treats successively of the Holy Scripture, of the charge of idolatry and superstition, of confession, of indulgences, of civil allegiance, and of obedience to the Pope, closing with these words: "We have endeavoured in the foregoing articles to set forth in a straightforward way those doctrines of our Church which in this country are most likely to be misunderstood and misrepresented; we hope, therefore, that our countrymen will receive both our declaration and our explanations in the spirit of truth and charity, and that those who have been hitherto either ignorant or misinformed as to what we believe will now do us the justice to acknowledge that as *Catholics* we hold no religious principles nor ideas not perfectly consistent with our duties as Christians and British subjects."[2]

The activity displayed by Catholic authors and Catholic priests called forth renewed efforts in all ranks of society to forward the interests of the old Church, and the number of *converts from Anglicanism was daily on the increase.*[3]

Ancient and distinctly Catholic institutions, such as convents of females, began to spring up. As early as 1794, French refugee nuns established themselves in England; a colony of Benedictine nuns from Brussels settled at Winchester, and others of Augustinian nuns from Louvain and Bruges came to reside at London and Hammersmith.[4] In 1838, a Catholic Institute was founded in London under the presidency of the Earl of *Shrewsbury*, with affiliated branches in other cities. About the same time a society of ladies was formed under the direction of the Marchioness of *Wellesly* for supplying poor chapels with vestments, altar furniture, and sacred vessels.[5] Within the limits of London there were eleven associations for providing free schools and four for serving and relieving the destitute sick. *Churches* and *chapels* also sprung up. The Catholics of London built a handsome

[1] *Bonn Review*, nro. 17, pp. 203-222; Latin text in *Braun*, Bibliotheca regular fid., T. I., p. 326.

[2] Not having the English text at hand, we have been obliged to translate from the German and French. (Tr.)

[3] Of the many beautiful writings of this kind, special mention should be made of Dr. *Sibthorp's* "My Return to Catholicity;" Germ., by *Willmann*, Ratisbon, 1848.

[4] *Eccl. Gazette*, by *Hoenighaus*, year 1838, nro. 31. Cfr. nro. 91.

[5] The Marchioness of Wellesly was a grand-daughter of *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, one of the signers of the Declaration of American Independence. (Tr.)

pro-cathedral, while those of York put a magnificent structure just opposite the famous old minster of that city.[1] The *Catholic population* of England soon increased to above two millions. Even in the Protestant *University of Oxford*, particularly in the college to which Dr. *Pusey* was attached, a strong *tendency* set in towards the Church of Rome.[2] After the year 1843 a large number of Puseyites, among whom were many Anglican clergymen, became converts to Catholicity. Of these the most distinguished was the celebrated Dr. *Newman*,[3] who, in 1848, founded a house of the Congregation of the Oratory at Birmingham. The influence of the reaction in favour of Catholicity was also felt among the sect of Scotch Presbyterians, founded by *Edward Irving* († 1834), whose followers claimed to enjoy the *gift of tongues* (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν),[4] and whose teachings found an able and eloquent defender in *Thiersch*, a professor of theology at Marburg, in Germany. The English also took up the cause of education with zeal. After the suppression of the English Colleges of St. Omar and of Douai by the French infidels, their professors passed over to England and opened the Colleges of St. Edmund, at Crook Hall, and St. Cuthbert, at Ushaw. The Jesuit College of Stonyhurst and that of St. Mary's near Birmingham, both of which were granted the privileges of university colleges by the queen, had a similar origin.[5] The universal interest excited throughout Europe by the religious movement in England created a desire to see the people of that country once more enter the fold of Christ. While Cardinal (then Doctor) Wiseman was giving assurances at Rome that the more intelligent of the English people were laying aside their prejudices against the Catholic Church, Lord *Spencer* was going up and down France asking prayers for the conversion of his countrymen,[6] an object for which *Saint Paul of the Cross* had prayed unceasingly for fifty years. To hasten the consummation of so glorious an event, Gregory XVI., on the 11th of May, 1840, subdivided the four *districts* previously existing into eight, and Pius IX., by the bull *Universalis Ecclesiæ*, dated September 29, 1850, restored the Catholic hierarchy to England. Between the years 1840 and 1852, ninety-two members of the University of Oxford and forty-three of the University of Cambridge

[1] Augsburg *Univ. Gazette*, nro. 147, May 27, 1842.

[2] On the recent Catholic movement in England, which has been hailed with such joy by the public Press, and on the part taken in it by Gregory XVI., cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 688-701; Vol. IX., pp. 65-79; on Puseyism, in particular, Vol. X., pp. 693-696, and Vol. XI., pp. 329 sq. In consequence of a sermon entitled *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, preached at Oxford in 1843, Dr. Pusey was suspended, and in self-defence appealed to the teaching of Anglican divines. This sermon was published in German, together with an *Introduction* on the present state of Anglicanism, by †*Willmann*, Ratisbon, 1844. *J. Gordon*, Du Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre, Par., 1844. The *same*, Conversion de cent cinquante ministres anglicains.

[3] A catalogue of the works of Dr. Newman is given in the *Characteristics of the Writings of John Henry Newman*, by *W. S. Lilly*, New York, 1875. (Tr.)

[4] **Joerg*, Hist. of Protestantism in the Latest Phases of its Development, Vol. II., pp. 77-203.

[5] *Eccl. Gazette*, 1840, nros. 29 and 32. Cf. nro. 9 of same year and nro. 89 of the year 1839.

[6] Cf. *Sion*, 1840, nro, 23, Supplem 4.

entered the Catholic Church. Of the former sixty-three were clergymen, and of the latter nineteen.

In *Scotland*, where the faith had never grown quite extinct, there began to be now signs of returning life. There were in that country only fifty-one churches in 1829. This number was increased to sixty-eight in 1839, and in 1848 to eighty-seven. A great Catholic Association was formed at *Edinburgh;* the *Catholic Review*, the *Catholic Magazine*, and the *Penny Orthodox Journal* were started to instruct the people; and public discussions were held, which went a great way in neutralizing the efforts of Protestant ministers to misrepresent the teachings of the Catholic Church, and to excite in those who were ignorant of the doctrines so vehemently assailed a desire to know their true character. Catholic higher education in Scotland was chiefly conducted by the clerical professors at the College of St. Mary's, at Blairs. At the opening of this century the Catholic population was about 13,000, and at the present time it is over 400,000, and is steadily growing, the increase being chiefly due to immigration from Ireland.

Ireland, with close upon seven millions of Catholics and a hierarchy consisting of four archbishops and twenty-two bishops,[1] still continued under her great leader, *Daniel O'Connell*,[2] the struggle she had entered upon under the celebrated legal and parliamentary orators, *Curran* († 1817)[3] and *Grattan*[4] († 1820), battling unceasingly for political and religious freedom. The efforts of Mr. O'Connell were well seconded by many churchmen of piety, energy, and learning, of whom the most able were *Dr. Doyle*,[5] Bishop of Kildare († June 15, 1834), a strenuous advocate of Emancipation, a forcible writer, and a distinguished professor of Carlow College; *Thomas Kelly*, Archbishop of Tuam († January 14, 1834), and his successor, *John MacHale*, who, over the signature of *Hierophilus*, wrote some clever controversial letters on the subject of Emancipation; and *Thomas Moore* († 1834), whose *Irish Melodies* contributed powerfully to evoke feelings of patriotic enthusiasm among the people of Ireland. The clergy, too, displayed so much activity, and were so devoted to the work of their ministry, that Mr. *Steele*, though an Anglican, stated publicly (August 25, 1841) that since the world began there had never been so admirable a moral union among men as that which existed among the Catholic priesthood of Ireland. The selection of bishops in the Church in Ireland is altogether elective. Formerly the parish priests chose from among those of their own rank, either within or without the diocese where the see was vacant, the person whom they

[1] This was the number in 1806. (Tr.)

[2] *Eccl. Gazette*, 1840, nro. 52. Cf. *Journal of Literary Amusement*, November, 1839.

[3] *John Philpot Curran's* fame rests mainly on his speeches in behalf of the accused in the State Trials, then so numerous. His life was published by his son, *W. H. Curran*, in 1819. (Tr.)

[4] The *Life and Times* of Henry Grattan were published by his son in the form of Memoirs, 4 vols., London, 1842. Cf. *Augsb. Gazette*, Supplem., May 18, 1842, and, for more general information, the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., pp. 736-751.

[5] See *Bonn Review*, nro. 9; *The Catholic*, 1825, Vol. XVII., pp. 1-17.

wished to have as bishop, and forwarded his name to the Pope. The bishops of the province also forwarded two or three names, any of which might be selected.[1] At the present time the priests themselves forward the three names from which a choice is to be made, though the Pope is not limited to these. As has been already stated, the Government offered a modified Relief Bill in 1813, on condition that the Crown should enjoy the right of *veto* in the appointment of bishops, but the condition was indignantly rejected by the whole hierarchy of the United Kingdom, notwithstanding the urgent representations in its favour by some Catholic laymen, and the efforts made by the Protestant advocates of Emancipation to have it accepted. In like manner the Irish bishops *unanimously* declined the endowment offered by the Government in 1837, preferring to remain poor but *free*. The Irish people have always contributed generously to the support of their priests. Under the energetic management of the clergy, new churches sprung up everywhere. The weekly contributions of the poorer classes were so munificent, that from these alone a very large portion of the cost of repairing old churches and building new ones has been defrayed. Among these, the Cathedral at *Killarney* and St. Patrick's Cathedral at *Armagh* may be instanced. The *Dublin Review*, started, in 1836, by *O'Connell*, *Dr. Wiseman*, and *Mr. Quin*, was the ablest Catholic periodical published in Ireland. The noticeable improvement in the moral condition of the Irish people since 1840 is largely due to the indefatigable labours of the Capuchin, *Father Mathew*, the great apostle of Temperance."[2]

§ 404. *The Catholic Church in Belgium and Holland.* (Cf. § 333.)

De Ram (Synodicum Belgicum), Nova et absoluta collectio Synodorum tam provincialium quam diœcesanar. Archiepiscopatus Mechlin, &c., T. I., Mechl., 1828; T. II., 1833; T. III. and T. IV., Gandav. "*Letters from Belgium*" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 627 sq.; Vol. VIII., p. 45 sq., 210 sq., 411 sq., 501 sq., 731 sq.; Vol. IX., p. 783 sq.)

The attempts made in Belgium to introduce the principles of Josephism, with a view to destroy the organization of the Catholic Church in that country, were heroically resisted by *Frankenberg* († 1804), the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines. His doctrinal declaration, dated June 26, 1789, concerning the General Seminary of Louvain, protesting against the erection of all seminaries of this character by Joseph II., is ample evidence that the clergy of Belgium were determined to withstand the hostile aggressions of the Illuminati and the Josephists. His zeal and activity exercised an influence which lasted until the close of the French domination, which affected only slightly the religious spirit of the country. While

[1] See *Plowden*, iii., Appendix, pp. 1-18. (Tr.)

[2] *Lps.*, Univ. Gazette, nrc. 134 (1842). *Cf. the interesting details in the *Augsb. Gazette*, nros. 144 and 145, of 1843, and the *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 4, pp. 208-210.

Belgium was under the dominion of *Holland* she made a long and determined struggle for the preservation of her faith and the *independence of the Church*. When *William*, Stadtholder of Holland, who professed Calvinistic doctrines, assumed the title of King of the Netherlands (March 16, 1815), and published a new constitution (July 15, 1815), he promised in general terms that the Catholic Church should enjoy complete freedom. But, as numerous paragraphs of the charter were directly contradictory to the promise made, the Bishops of Ghent, Tournay, and Namur, and the Vicars Capitular of Malines and Liége drew up and published, July 28, 1815, an expostulation. No attention was paid to their remonstrances, and the new charter, though it failed to obtain a majority of the votes of the Committee of Examiners, was imposed upon the country, August 24, 1815, and from that time forth acts of violence and oppression against Catholics became more frequent and flagrant. Catholic Colleges and Universities were closed, and Catholic students of divinity were required to attend the lectures at the *Philosophical College*, established by a Protestant Government at Louvain in 1825. So threatening was the discontent which these measures excited that King William was forced to conclude a *concordat* with the Holy See in 1827.[1] Its execution, however, was delayed under various pretexts, and although the Government released candidates for the priesthood from the obligation of attending the College of Louvain, it imposed other annoying restrictions upon bishops and students of divinity,[2] and made the Dutch language obligatory. National manners and customs were daily and studiously disregarded and outraged, and the forcible separation of *Belgium* from *Holland* was in consequence finally determined upon in 1830, though, in the revolution by which this was effected, the Belgian clergy, who, as a body, were peaceable and law-abiding, took no active part. Since then Catholicity has been steadily on the increase in Belgium. Through the influence of such men as Cardinal *Sterckx*, Archbishop of Malines, and *Van Bommel*, Bishop of Liége, it has been made to give tone to public opinion and character to education. Religious life revived, and convents sprang up over the country.

Thoroughly alive to the dangerous influence of the *Philosophical College* of Louvain, the Catholics, after numerous conferences, came voluntarily forward and generously subscribed a sum sufficient to found, in 1834, a free *Catholic University* at Malines,[3] which was subsequently transferred to *Louvain*, and solemnly inaugurated on

[1] See *The Catholic*, 1827, November nro., p. 203 sq.

[2] The conflicting views on this subject are given in *The Catholic*, 1825, Supplem. to December nro., p. XXXIII. sq.; and 1826, January nro., pp. 83-103, and Supplem., p. I. sq. *Tübing. Quart. Review*, 1826, p. 77 sq. *Smets*, Cath. Review of Cologne, Vols. I. and II. In consequence of these diverse criticisms, the King of Holland issued, in 1829, two ordinances, which, in appearance only, repealed the measures of 1825. See *The Catholic*, August, 1829, Supplem., p. XXIV. sq., and October, p. 47 sq.

The plan of founding a University by a joint-stock company, as set forth in the circular of the Archbishop of Malines, and of the Bishops of Tournay, Ghent, Liége, Namur, and Bruges, may be found by referring to the journals of those times. The *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, p. 189 sq.; *The Catholic*, July nro. of 1834, pp. 80-89.

the 1st of December, 1835. This University is one of the most important foundations of this century; for, besides counteracting the liberalistic tendencies of the University of Brussels, it is a representative school, not alone of Catholic theology, but of every branch of professional science, as taught in Catholic institutions; and is, moreover, the most frequented seat of learning in Belgium. Fully appreciating the position of the Church, the Belgian clergy kept well abreast of the spirit of the age, seizing, making their own, and ennobling such ideas as they might, and putting the others aside. Here was harmony amid the din of conflict, and music amid a clamour of sounds, for the spirit of true liberty is ever in accord with the spirit of true faith. *A society was started for the diffusion of wholesome literature*, which did an immensity of good among the people. Belgium comes next after France and Bavaria in zeal for *home and foreign missionary work*.[1] The Abbé *Helsen*,[2] who had been suspended from the exercise of his priestly functions, in consequence of the irregularity of his moral conduct, attempted to found what he called the *Catholic and Apostolical Church*, and having received episcopal consecration from Fabre Palaprat, rented a room in the Masonic Lodge at Brussels, and began to say Mass in French and Flemish. The public gradually wearied of his declamations against the supposed immorality of the clergy. The Chamber slighted and insulted him, comparing him to *Châtel* and other politico-religious mountebanks. Like those of his French prototype, his followers rapidly fell from his side, only a few fanatical revolutionists and uncompromising republicans remaining loyal to his teachings. Touched by the light of grace, Helsen returned to the truth, November 14, 1842, and died some time after at peace with the Church. The progress made by the *Religious Orders* in Belgium was simply marvellous. In 1829 there were in the whole country 280 houses of male and female religious, and, in 1846, the number had increased to 779. Here devoted souls gave themselves up to meditation, teaching, serving the sick, and to such other offices of piety as are required by the social conditions of a civilized community. It is a strange phenomenon, and one fruitful in reflections, that in no country of Europe have the Religious Orders been so bitterly and persistently opposed as in Belgium, and in no other country of Europe have they gone on increasing so rapidly.

The Catholic Church in *Holland* has continued to hold its own against the inveterate hatred of the Calvinists, the disintegrating agency of Jansenism, and the adverse policy of a hostile Government. According to the official census, there were, in January, 1840, 1,100,616 *Catholics* out of a population of 2,860,450.[3] The *Jansenistic schism of Utrecht*, which, unfortunately, has not yet come to a close, had, in 1821, an archbishop at Utrecht, in whose obedience there were twenty-four pastors and two thousand five hundred and twenty schis-

[1] Cf. *Eccl. Gazette*, by *Hoeninghaus*, year 1839, nro. 72.
[2] *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, pp. 187-189.
[3] Cf. *The Catholic*, 1825, Supplem. to February nro., pp. XVII.-XXVII.

matics; a suffragan bishop at *Haarlem*, under whom were twenty pastors and two thousand four hundred and thirty-eight souls; and a bishop at *Deventer*, who possessed neither pastors nor flock. These bishops are all excommunicated by the Holy See, and were it not for the support which the Jansenistic seminary at Utrecht receives from France, the schism of which it is the nursery, would have long since disappeared. Until quite recently the Catholics of Holland were collectively included in what was known as the *Dutch Mission*, presided over by a *Vicar-Apostolic*, and divided into the seven districts or archpresbyteries of Holland-Zealand, Utrecht, Gelderland, Friesland, Groningen, Overyssel, and Salland, which were subdivided into deaneries, and these again into four hundred stations or parishes. When Cardinal *Brancadoro*, Archbishop of Nisibis, who resided at Liége, came to Holland, in 1776, as superior of the Dutch Mission, to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, the tokens of respect and attachment to the Holy See which the Catholic people exhibited were universal and unmistakable. The Mission was, later on, under the direction of *Ciamberlani*, who resided at Münster, whence all necessary dispensations were forwarded. He also presided in an informal way over the affairs of the Mission during the reigns of *Louis Bonaparte* and his successor, the Duke of Piacenza, but, after the restoration of the Protestant Government, he was arrested at Malines, in 1815, and conducted across the frontier, despite the indignant protests of the Catholics. This hasty and violent measure was reconsidered in 1823, and Ciamberlani again authorized to take charge of the Mission. His first official act on his return was to consecrate the chapel and bless the *Seminary of Warmond*, near Leyden,[1] which the clergy and laity had built, in 1819, out of their scanty means. There is no name held in more grateful remembrance by the Church and the clergy of Holland than that of the Abbé *Raynal*, almoner to the Spanish embassy at the Hague († July 6, 1822), who, after his expulsion from the diocese of Cahors by the French revolutionists, took up his residence in the Netherlands, where, by his zeal, his salutary influence upon the clergy, and his edifying life, he rendered invaluable services during a season of trial and difficulty to the Catholic Church of that country.

According to the articles of the concordat, concluded between King William and the Holy See, of which mention has already been made, two suffragan sees should have been erected in the *Netherlands*, the one at Amsterdam and the other at Herzogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc), but this provision was never carried out. Catholic principle and Catholic feeling were wholly disregarded, and sometimes violently outraged, and a Protestant church, aided by a Protestant Government, was everywhere dominant.

It would seem that the very significant warning given by the

[1] In 1828 there were in the ancient States of Holland four larger and three smaller seminaries, which it had been found necessary to erect after the closing of the University of Louvain.

Revolution in Belgium in 1830 was not sufficient to secure full freedom to the Church in that country. Still, after the accession of *William II.*, October 7, 1840, there was a hope that an accommodation might be effected through the negotiations opened by the Nuncio, *Cappaccini*. The Calvinists were again beginning to show symptoms of the most intolerant bigotry, which fortunately had not resulted in any serious consequences, when Pius IX., on the 7th of March, 1853, re-established the Catholic hierarchy in Holland. It consisted of an archbishopric at *Utrecht*, with four suffragan sees at *Haarlem*, *Herzogenbosch*, *Breda*, and *Roermond*. In spite of the hostility of the Government to religious houses, their number was constantly increasing. When the Netherlands were incorporated with the French empire, in 1810, there were altogether only fifteen convents in the whole country, and these were all in North Brabant, and suppressed by Imperial decree of January 3, 1812, though the decree was never carried into effect. Notwithstanding this unpromising condition of affairs, and the additional fact that William I. did what he could to retard the growth of the Catholic Church, numerous religious houses were founded in North Brabant and Limburg between the years 1830 and 1840.

That isolated portion of *Luxemburg*, which, under the designation of the Grand Duchy, was declared a dependency of Holland in 1839, was under the spiritual direction of a very worthy man, Mgr. *Laurent*, who, having been driven from Hamburg, where he had taken up his residence as Vicar-Apostolic of North Germany, found himself face to face with similar difficulties in his new diocese, whence he was also expelled in 1847. By the Revolution of 1848, freedom of conscience was inscribed in the Charter of Rights, and now even the Jesuits have firmly established themselves in Holland.

§ 405. *The Catholic Church in Switzerland.*

The documents are found chiefly in the *Tüb. Quart. Review* of 1819 and subsequent years. *Rheinwald*, Acta hist. ecclesiast., ann. 1835, p. 31 et sq.; ann. 1836, p. 58 sq.; ann. 1837, p. 82 sq. *L. Snell*, Authentic Narrative of the Late Changes in Catholic Switzerland, Sursee, 1831. For the most recent times, see "*The Swiss Eccl. Gaz.*," from 1832. **Fred. Hurter*, The Attacks made on the Catholic Church in Switzerland since 1831, 4 pts., Schaffh., 1842, 1843. *Sigwart Müller*, The Struggle between Right and Might in the Swiss Confederacy, and My Own Share in It, Altdorf, 1864. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. IX., p. 853 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, pp. 484-505.

The Church in Switzerland was formerly dependent for its ecclesiastical government upon the metropolitans of *Besançon*, *Mentz*, and *Milan*. The fulsome promises of the French, who came to that country in 1797, proclaiming that they desired to restore *liberty* to the descendants of William Tell, to free them from the government of an oligarchy, and to place them in the enjoyment of the rights of man, were, as in France, far from being fulfilled, and resulted only in political anarchy and religious disorganization. The relations of the western portion of Switzerland with the Church of France were severed

When political order had been in some sort restored (1803), the Catholic Cantons, then under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Constance*, petitioned the Holy See to establish a bishopric within their own territory. The petition was again urged in 1814, and finally granted by *Pius VII.* on the 7th of October.

In delivering the papal brief to the Diet, the Nuncio announced that the Holy Father had appointed *Goeldlin of Tiefenau*, Prior of the ancient Abbey of St. Michael's, at Beromünster, Vicar-Apostolic over three Cantons.[1] But while the representatives of the Cantons unanimously agreed that it was necessary to establish a see, and that the appointment was a good one, there were other matters of detail which were not so easily adjusted. Each Canton had its own interests, each member of the Diet his own views.

Unfortunately, no satisfactory settlement had been arrived at, when news was received of the death of Goeldlin, in the prime of his life (1819). His successor, *Charles Rudolph of Buol Schaunstein*, Prince Bishop of *Coire*, was by no means so acceptable a choice, and the Canton of *Aargau* demanded to be again placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constance. The intention was to include the Cantons formerly belonging to Constance within the jurisdiction of the newly reorganized see of *Basle*, whose incumbent was then residing at Offenburg, in Baden, and Pius VII. cut matters short by appointing as his suffragan and coadjutor the Prior, *Glutz Ruchti*, of the collegiate church of Soleure. By subsequent negotiations, a union was formed among the Catholic inhabitants of the Cantons of Basle, Lucerne, Berne, Soleure, and Aargau. Pius VII. settled the difficulty relative to the Abbey of St. Gall by creating it an episcopal see (July 2, 1823), and bestowing upon Charles Rudolph the double title of Bishop of *Coire* and *St. Gall*. The two sees were separated in 1836.[2] The proposal to unite by concordat the original Cantons of *Uri*, *Schwytz*, and *Unterwalden* with the bishopric of Coire was rejected by the Pope, January 7, 1823. Finally, in reply to a petition from the Catholics of Geneva, the hot-bed of Calvinism, requesting the establishment of a bishopric in that Canton, *Pius VII.*, by the bull *Inter multiplices*, placed them under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Lausanne*, residing at Fribourg.[3] The way was now clear for a definite settlement of the ecclesiastical affairs of Switzerland, and accordingly a *concordat* was entered into with Pope *Leo XII.*, and promulgated in May, 1828, by the bull *Inter præcipua Nostri Apostolatus munia*. The concordat provided that the Catholic inhabitants of the Cantons of Lucerne, Soleure, Berne, Aargau, Basle, Zug, and Thurgau should form the *diocese of Basle*, the bishop to reside at *Soleure ;* that the bishop of the diocese should have a

[1] Cfr. *Hurter*, L. c., pp. 45-49. *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1820, pp. 734-741; 1821, pp. 164-171.

[2] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1824, pp. 317-333; 1826, pp. 728-731.

[3] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, year 1820, pp. 346-355. Cfr. pp. 726-734; pp. 741-744; year 1821, pp. 363-366.

chapter consisting of twenty-one canons and two dignitaries, the one appointed by the Government, the other by the Pope;[1] and that to the canons should belong the right of electing the new bishop, to whom the Pope should give canonical appointment, &c. These stipulations were rejected by many of the cantons in whose name they had been made, and in consequence a new arrangement was entered into between Lucerne, Berne, Soleure, and Zug, on the one hand, and the Internuncio *Gizzi*, acting for the Pope, on the other,[2] to which Aargau and Thurgau gave their assent in 1830, during the pontificate of Pius VIII.[3] Finally, after some further negotiations,[4] it was determined to distribute the 882,859 Catholics in Switzerland in 1841 (the Protestants of all denominations at the same date numbering 1,292,871, and the Jews 1,755) into *six dioceses*, as follows: 1. The diocese of *Basle*, including the Cantons of Lucerne, Zug, Soleure (the residence of the bishop), Aargau, Thurgau, Basle, Zürich, and Berne (Jura); 2. The diocese of *Lausanne* and *Geneva*, including the Cantons of Fribourg, Geneva, Vaud, Neufchâtel, and Berne (as far as the Aar); 3. The diocese of *Sion* (Sitten), including the Canton of Valais; 4. The diocese of *Coire* (Chur) and *St. Gall*, including the Cantons of Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Glarus, Grisons, Appenzell, Schaffhausen, and *St. Gall*, which, by the concordat of 1845, was again made a distinct see, thus forming the fifth diocese; and 6. A diocese whose jurisdiction was determined by the character of the subjects rather than by territorial limits, for it comprised all Catholics speaking the Italian language within the Canton of *Ticino*, and was, until July 22, 1859, under the care of the Bishop of *Como* and the Archbishop of *Milan*.[5] There being no archiepiscopal see in Switzerland, the bishops of that country are immediately subject to the Holy See, and there is, in consequence, a *Nuncio Apostolic* resident at *Lucerne*, a circumstance that greatly facilitates the management of ecclesiastical affairs.

While there is probably no other country in which the principles of Modern Liberalism have taken such deep root, and developed into forms so various and conflicting as in the Helvetian Confederacy, neither is there any other country in which Liberals, in spite of their internal dissensions, so completely lose sight of party lines in their common hostility to the Church, or combine with more hearty unanimity against her. This spirit has still grown more intensely malignant since the occurrence of the events of 1830 and 1831. Switzerland is called the land of freedom, but it is in reality under the tyranny of radicalism. Day after day, with unremitting continuity, the Press

[1] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1828, pp. 556-568.
[2] *Ibid.*, 1829, pp. 154-183.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1830, pp. 603-610. For the reasons of their refusal, see *Hurter*, pp. 49-56.
[4] *Ibid.*, year 1830, pp. 603-610.
[5] A full statement of the condition of religion in certain dioceses may be found in *The Catholic* of 1834, Vol. LIII., pp. 306-332; Vol. LIV., pp. 8-44; 1836, Vol. LXI., pp. 21-46; Vol. LXII., pp. 36-57, and 156-173; also in *Hurter*, L. c., concerning *Zürich*, pp. 361-369 sq.; concerning *Lucerne*, p. 407; concerning *Glarus*, p. 481 sq.

scatters over the country profane jests and foul calumnies against Catholic priests, convents, and Jesuits; against the Pope and his Nuncio, and the Church and her institutions. And so unblushing has been the dishonesty practised and so desperate the methods employed by these Liberals that they have even gone the length of forging papal bulls. To defend themselves against the attacks of this perfidious warfare, the Catholics, in 1832, established the *Ecclesiastical Journal of Switzerland*, which, it was hoped, would revive and quicken religious sentiment among the people, maintain the rights of the Church and of religion, correct false assertions, and repel slanders. It was soon discovered that there were traitors among those professing to be defenders of the Church. Some Catholic theologians of the school of *Paolo Sarpi*, and infected with the poison of modern indifferentism, started in opposition to the *Ecclesiastical Journal of Switzerland* a paper called the *Religious Gazette for Germany and Switzerland*. Its editor, a certain *Fischer*, of indifferent reputation, drifting with the current of radical opinion, proclaimed that separation from the Holy See would be a supreme blessing to the Catholic Church in Switzerland. Encouraged by such disloyalty and treachery, the radical Press grew more audacious and energetic, and poured forth an incessant stream of *irreligious calendars*, *blasphemous almanacs*, *atheistical pamphlets*, *historical and sacrilegious essays*, and *immoral novels*.[1] Animated by such feelings of hostility to the Catholic Church, representatives of the progressive party from the various Cantons assembled at *Baden*, in 1834, and, ignoring all established relations and existing legal guarantees, drew up the instrument known as the *Articles of Conference*, by which the Church was reduced to a condition of civil servitude.

Gregory XVI., feeling that there was now a call upon him to act, issued, May 17, 1835, an encyclical letter[2] to all the Swiss bishops, condemning the Articles, which, however, were enforced, regardless of all protests, in many of the Cantons. Catholic families loving their faith and loyal to its teachings, took alarm, and wishing to provide a school where their children might receive proper training, they established a *college* at *Schwytz*,[3] which was placed under the direction of the Jesuits, whose pedagogical labours had been so successful at *Fribourg*, where a similar seat of learning had been founded three hundred years ago by the illustrious *Canisius*, and restored in 1818.[4] The Jesuits' college at Fribourg was fre-

[1] *Hurter*, in his comprehensive *Chronique Scandaleuse* of Modern Switzerland, has drawn a frightful picture of these excesses of the Press.

[2] The articles of the conference, in fourteen paragraphs, or a new kind of church polity, in *The Catholic*, Supplement to the May number of 1834; *Hurter*, L. c., p. 274 sq.; the Pope's Encyclica, in *The Catholic*, Supplement to the January number of 1836; and the *Tüb. Quart. Review* of 1835, pp. 773-758.

[3] *The Catholic*, year 1836, Vol. LXII., p. 58 sq.

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. LXII., p. 58 sq., 1836, concerning the College of Schwytz; concerning that of Fribourg, *ibid.*, 1834, Vol. LIV., pp. 33-44; *Hurter*, L. c., p. 507 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 38 sq., 210 sq. *Piccolomini*, A few words on the Boarding Schools and the Colleges of the Jesuits in Switzerland, Ratisbon, 1843.

quented, not alone by the Catholic youth who had been withdrawn from the schools of Lucerne and Soleure, on account of the Liberalism prevalent there, but also by young men from every religious denomination and political party in Switzerland, and by others coming from foreign lands. There was also an *educational establishment* founded at *Montet*, in the same Canton, under the direction of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, in which a number of young ladies received instruction. The Government of the Canton Aargau, among all the Swiss Cantons, has the distinction of having enacted the most severe law against the Church. In direct violation of the Federal Compact[1] of August 7, 1815, this Canton passed a law January 20, 1841, suppressing all convents within its confines, notwithstanding that some of them were coeval in origin with the very dawn of Swiss history.

Gizzi, the Apostolic Nuncio, and the Austrian ambassador, *De Bombelles*, at once protested against the measure,[2] stating that it was not a question as to whether a few convents should cease to exist or not, but as to whether the principles of liberty should be maintained and the Federal Compact preserved or the contrary. The Great Council, they said, by suppressing Catholic convents, had at once violated the Twelfth Article of the Federal Compact, and dealt a blow at religious freedom. The discontent excited by this measure was so widespread and threatening[3] that the *Directorial Canton*, by an enactment, passed in the month of February, 1843, declared all sales of monastic property made since the meeting of the Diet in 1841 of no effect, and summoned the Canton of Aargau to revoke them, and to repeal other measures antagonistic to the then existing state of affairs, declaring its intention, in case of refusal, to proceed according to the principles upon which the Confederacy was based. It was a great comfort and consolation to the loyal children of the Church, amid these scenes of radical violence, to learn that a new constitution of a decidedly Catholic character had been adopted in *Lucerne* by a surprisingly large majority of the popular votes (March, 1842).[4] After numerous writings and prolonged discussion, it was

[1] Paragraph Twelfth reads: "The cantonal governments will see to it that the monasteries and chapters are maintained, and that their prosperity is secure. Their possessions, like all other private property, shall be subject to tax and other imposts." Cf. *The Catholics of Aargau and Radicalism* (Memorial), 1843; also *Augsb. Univ. Gazette*, nro 173, of 1843.

[2] *Le Journal des Débats*, August 9.

[3] Cfr. "Encroachments of the Government of Aargau upon the Catholics" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. II., p. 179 sq., 214 sq., 295 sq.) The last Attempts against the Monasteries in Switzerland (*Ibid.*, Vol. IV., p. 204 sq., 281 sq.; Vol. VII., p. 422 sq.) "The Aargau State Paper" (*Ibid.*, Vol. VII., p. 532 sq.; Vol. VIII., p. 224 sq., 337 sq., 440 sq.) See also "*The Eccl. Journal of South Germany*," 1839, nros. 2, 4, and 6.

[4] The Third Article reads as follows: "The Apostolic and Roman Catholic religion is the religion of the whole population of Lucerne, and as such is the religion of the State. The Government, therefore, shall in no way, either directly or indirectly, restrain, limit, or hinder the intercourse of priests, citizens, and communities with the authorities and functionaries of the Roman Catholic Church in whatever relates to religious ecclesiastical affairs. However, all ecclesiastical ordinances and regulations must

resolved, in January, 1844, that the *nuns* of the convents of Fahr, Hermetschwil, Gnadenthal, and Baden, suppressed in 1841, should be permitted to again take possession of their houses. The *mitred Abbot* of the Benedictine monastery of *Muri*, who had been on trial for certain political offences, was acquitted, declared exempt from all penalty, and the State adjudged to pay the costs.[1] The Radicals, however, had no intention of giving up the contest. In the Diet of 1844, the representatives from the Canton of Aargau made an unsuccessful attempt to have the Jesuits banished from the whole of Switzerland; and when, on the 24th of October of the same year, the inhabitants of Lucerne voted to recall the members of the society, and place the theological schools of the Canton under their direction, the Radicals of the whole country rose in indignation.

In December, 1844, and again in March, 1845, two armies of volunteers, led against the Catholics of Lucerne, under pretext of overthrowing the *domination of the Jesuits*, were successively repulsed. Lucerne, now fully alive to the dangers that threatened her, entered into an alliance with the neighbouring Catholic Cantons for their mutual protection. The Radicals now determined to avenge their defeat. As a preliminary step, they hired a vile wretch by the name of *Jacob Müller* to assassinate *Joseph Leu*,[2] a prosperous and honourable merchant, gifted with splendid oratorical powers, who had excited the hostility of his enemies because he was the leader in his day of every Catholic movement in Switzerland. The assassin afterwards confessed his crime, and was beheaded, January 31, 1846. In the Cantons of Vaud, Berne, and Zürich the Governments had voted against the expulsion of the Jesuits, but they were forced to yield to the dominant influence of the other Cantons which favoured the measure. The opponents of the Jesuits, and those desiring their expulsion and the suppression of their schools were daily gaining strength, and for this reason those Cantons which had either protected the society or placed their schools under its direction, viz., Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais, gave their support to the separate alliance (*Sonderbund*) formed in 1843, and appointed a council of war to act in the emergency of a conflict. On the 20th of July, 1846, the Diet, by a small majority, declared the Sonderbund inconsistent with the well-being of the Confederation, and therefore dissolved. To enforce this decree, the Diet brought a numerous army into the field, and a fratricidal and unholy war was commenced against the Catholics of the Sonderbund, who were completely vanquished, but whether their defeat is to be attributed to too much confidence in the justness of their cause, or to the mistakes of their leaders, or to treachery, it is difficult to say.

be submitted to the Government before publication. The relations of Church and State should be adjusted by an amicable understanding between the two powers. The State guarantees the inviolability of foundations and other ecclesiastical property.

The Catholic, 1844, nro. 2; *South Germ. Eccl. Journal*, 1843, nros. 48 and 52.

[2] *Sigwart Müller*, Councilman Joseph Leu, of Ebersoll, Altdorf, 1863.

[3] *Crétineau-Joly*, Histoire du Sonderbund, Paris, 1850, 2 vols.

Fribourg was taken, after a short and ineffectual resistance, on the 9th of November, and the 23rd of the same month the army of the Sonderbund was routed at Gislikon, near the frontier of Lucerne, and the seven Catholic Cantons passed under the despotic and intolerant Government of the dominant party. Heavy war contributions were levied, forty convents were suppressed, religious freedom vanished, and the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva was sent into exile. Such were some of the results of this war, in every way so disastrous to Catholic Switzerland.[1] As we shall see further on, these deeds of violence called forth a reaction, which infused new life and fresh energy into the Catholics of that country.

§ 406. *The Catholic Church in Austria.*

Boost, Modern Hist. of Austria (1789-1839), Augsburg, 1839, p. 101 sq. *Beidtel*, Researches on the Situation of the Church in the Austrian States, Vienna, 1849. *Scharpff*, Pt. II., pp. 74-93. *Gams*, Hist of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 509-561. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 1060 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 2, p. 147 sq.

Alarmed at the symptoms of revolution which now began to show themselves, and which were the legitimate outcome of the fatal policy of his brother, Joseph II., *Leopold II.*, who became emperor, March 12, 1790, set his face against the liberalistic and philosophical tendencies which were being forced upon Austria in spite of herself, and, by the repeal of certain unpopular laws of his predecessor's, succeeded in allaying the secret agitation, which kept the emperor in a state of uncertainty and excitement. Such of the laws of Joseph II. as interfered with the free administration of ecclesiastical affairs he either abrogated altogether or practically set aside. He closed the General Seminaries, permitted bishops to educate their clergy in their own schools, authorized the use of the Latin language in the administration of the sacraments and other liturgical offices, and recognized the rights of the Roman Pontiff in whatever relates to the sacrament of marriage. He also satisfied the claims of the Protestants by incorporating in the twenty-six articles of the laws of 1791 the edicts of 1608, 1647, and 1648, granting to the Lutherans and Calvinists of Hungary freedom of worship. Finally, he forced the Turks to conclude a treaty of peace, re-establishing the *statu quo* as it existed on the 9th of February, 1788, previously to the breaking out of the war. Though Leopold did much to ameliorate the condition of the Church by practically disregarding existing laws, he did not fully emancipate her from the *tyranny of a civil bureaucracy*. The system of Joseph II. was indeed ignored, but it had, nevertheless, as a whole, a legal sanction and a recognized existence.[2] Such was the state of affairs when *Francis II.* (March, 1792-1835), ascended the throne. This prince deeply sympathized with the Head of the Church in his misfortunes, and, taking as his patterns,

[1] *The Catholic* of 1847 and 1848; also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. XX. and XXI.

[2] *Baron von Eckstein*, The (Austrian) Clergy in their Relation to Public Instruction (*The Catholic* of 1828, Vol. XXVII., pp 11-21, 268-293).

not his immediate predecessors, but those more illustrious men of whom his ancestral house furnished so many, he became at once the patron of the Church and the *protector* of the Holy See. The emperor was in Rome in 1819, and *Pius VII.*, happy to have an opportunity to give some token of his esteem for the royal house of the Hapsburgs, raised the Archduke *Rudolph* to the archiepiscopal see of Olmütz, and created him a cardinal. In 1842, *Gregory XVI.* conferred similar dignities, for a like reason, upon the prince *Schwarzenberg*, Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg.

If the Church in Austria, nevertheless, continued for the half a century during which *Prince Metternich* was First Minister, subject to the Josephist system, and under the control of the civil authority, the fault is to be ascribed to the indifference of the bishops, rather than to the will of the Government. Many of these bishops, men, too, of learning and irreproachable lives, had, by appointment of Government, taken an active part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs while the Church was still under the control of the State, and now, from force of habit, showed a certain tenderness and attachment to a system they themselves had helped to perpetuate, sincerely believing that the Church could not be equally well governed in any other way. But bitter experience soon showed that, no matter how beneficial such methods might seem in themselves, they were, in reality, whether intended to be so or not, encroachments of the civil authority upon the rights of the Church. For example, in 1802, "*the Court of Chancery*," acting upon representations made to it, and without consulting the bishops, passed two decrees, providing for the increase of the number of the secular clergy and the restoration of discipline in the convents.[2] Again, in 1804, new ordinances were published relative to public schools, removing them from the control of the bishops, and placing them under that of *consistories*, because these, being the creations of the State, would pursue its policy as regards methods of teaching, the selection of text-books, the conducting of examinations, and the mode of inspection. Again, in 1810, *Pehem's* work on canon law was thrown out of the schools, and that of *Rechberger* introduced, because the latter upheld a system of ecclesiastical polity in favour with Government, and on the whole treated the Church as little better than a civil institution, and therefore dependent upon the State. But, since 1808, the bishops have enjoyed a larger measure of influence in

[1] See § 390, at the beginning.

[2] In attempting to correct the existing evils by the very means by which they had been produced, the Aulic Chancery showed that it did not understand their real character. By the first autograph of April 2, 1802, it was prescribed that gymnasia, schools of philosophy, and diocesan seminaries should be established, and if required, that a course of theology be added. Now, putting aside the circumstance that these measures were prescribed by a body incompetent to deal with such affairs, they could not possibly have served any useful purpose, because the Josephist programme and the uncatholic text-books were still retained, and the schools continued to be under the control of the State. The second rescript, of the same date, requiring religious to wear their habits and observe their rules, "except in the instances in which these had been modified by imperial decrees, and forbidding all intercourse with foreign superiors," was not, it would seem, of a character to restore discipline in the monasteries. *Brück*, Church Hist., p. 758, sq. (Tr.)

whatever relates to primary schools and theological establishments, and in judging of the orthodoxy and moral fitness of aspirants to the priesthood. These measures, together with the restoration of seminaries and faculties of Catholic theology, led the way to the publication of many works of merit, which exercised a wide and beneficent influence. Such were the writings of Powondra, Reichenberger, Zenner, and others on pastoral theology, and of Klein, von Rauscher, and Ruttenstock on Church history. In appointing to bishoprics, the Emperor Francis was careful to select only men of distinction and ability, whose lives were an example to their flocks,[1] and who devoted themselves zealously and energetically to the primary schools, to public instruction of every grade, and especially to the training of young men for the priesthood. Of these it will be sufficient to enumerate *Sigismund, Count of Hohenwarth*, Archbishop of Vienna from 1803; *Wenceslaus Leopold Chlumczansky*, Bishop of Leitmeritz from 1802, and Prince-Archbishop of Prague from 1814; *Leopold Maximilian, Count de Firmian*, Archbishop of Salzburg, and from 1822 to 1832 Archbishop of Vienna; *James Frint*, Bishop of St. Pölten, from 1827 to 1835; and *Francis Salm*, Bishop of Gurk and Klagenfurt († 1822), who, with generous hospitality, received the pious and learned *Benedictines*, among whom were such men as *Neugart* and *Boppert*, when they had been expelled from their monastery of *Saint-Blaise*, in the Black Forest.[2] In order to check the disintegrating spirit of the age, and to provide a system of education for youth, which should be at once serious and solid, and having as little in common with the sonorous and senseless phraseology of false philosophers as with the torpid lethargy of the enemies of true progress, the *Jesuits*, who had been so long misunderstood and misrepresented, were again invited to return to the empire in 1820. The members of the society at once opened their houses at Verona, Innspruck, Linz, Lemberg, and Tarnopol.

The *Redemptorists*, under that excellent man, *Clement M. Hofbauer*,[3] had already established themselves, in 1816, at Vienna. The Religious Orders soon received fresh and able allies in their struggle for the Gospel and the Church. Associating with himself *Zachary Werner* and other writers who shared his convictions, *Frederic Schlegel* began in the *Germanic Museum* and the *Austrian Observer* a vigorous assault upon Protestantism, which he continued with marked ability in his *lectures*. His writings revived the spirit of Catholicity in Germany, and exerted a powerful influence, particularly among the upper classes. In *Hungary*, where Protestantism had taken a faster hold on the people

[1] See list of Austrian bishops, apud *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 509-533.

[2] Cfr. *Gams*, Hist. of the Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 527-531, and the Würzburg *Chilianeum*, Vol. I., of 1862, pp. 197-200.

[3] *Poesl*, Clement Maria Hofbauer, the first German Redemptorist, Ratisbon, 1844. *Sebast. Brunner*, C. M. Hofbauer and His Age, Vienna, 1858. *Haringer*, The Life of the Servant of God, Cl. M. Hofbauer, Vienna, 1864. Life of the Venerable C. M. Hofbauer, Priest of the Congr. of Most Holy Redeemer. By a member of the Order of Mercy, New York, 1877. (Tr.)

than in any other province of the Austrian Empire, a *national council* was convoked, with the consent of the emperor, by *Alexander Rudnay*, Archbishop of Gran and Primate of Hungary, to meet on the 8th of September, 1822, the object of which was stated to be "to check the decay of morality; to ward off the evils with which the scourge of impiety was menacing both Church and State; and to re-establish ancient ecclesiastical discipline among the clergy and the people and in the schools."[1]

In other parts of the Austrian Empire, where the German language was spoken, the discussion of ecclesiastical and theological questions was carried on through the pages of the *Thelogical Journal of Frint* from the year 1808. It was discontinued for a while, but again revived, in 1828, by *Pletz*, who conducted it until his death in 1840.[2] The *Linz Theological Monthly*, and still later the *Linz and Salzburg Quarterly* were each very valuable as able and reliable exponents of the principles of pastoral theology. The *Society of Mechitarists for the diffusion of Catholic literature* and the *Leopoldine Association* for the propagation of Christianity, particularly in America, rendered important services to religion. An unusual activity in the domain of speculative theology has quite recently begun to manifest itself, notably among the clergy of the school of *Günther*, whose ablest organ is the *Gazette of Catholic Theology of Vienna*, edited in 1850, and for years after by *Scheiner*, and *Häusle*, and more recently by *Wiedemann*. Journals in the vernacular, among others the *Journal of Sion*, were also started in Bohemia and Hungary. Wholly regardless either of the laws of Joseph II. or of the clamour of the Liberals, the Hungarian bishops, when the *question of mixed marriages*[3] came up, exerted themselves with an energy only equalled by their prudence to have the teaching of the Church carried out, following in this the example set them by *Ziegler*, Bishop of Linz in 1838. After publishing a pastoral letter to their clergy, to which they added a general instruction on the subject of mixed marriages, they sent Bishop *Lonovics* to Rome to obtain specific instructions from the Holy See for Hungary, as those already given for the States of Austria did not seem applicable to that country.[4] Hoping to adjust the conflicting claims of both parties, the emperor, by a rescript of July 5, 1843, and by a second of March 25, 1844, decided that in mixed marriages the parents should determine the kind of religious education to be given

[1] A succinct historical notice, together with the documents, may be found in *The Catholic* of 1822, Vol. VI., pp. 324-346. *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 535-540.

[2] *Vincent Seback*, Dr. Jos. Pletz, being a Biographical Sketch, Vienna, 1841.

[3] Cf. *Sion*, 1841, nros. 127-130; the circular of the bishops in *The Catholic*, February 1841, Supplem., p. LIX. sq. The letter of the Primate *Joseph Kopacsy* to the Estates of the County of Pesth, which had declared any priest refusing to give the nuptial benediction in mixed marriages liable to a fine of 600 florins (*Sion*, 1841, nro. 7, Supplem.) Cf., also, *The Catholic*, 1842, January number, Supplem., p. IV.; March number, Supplem., p. CXIX. sq.

[4] *The Catholic*, 1841, December, Suppl., p. LXXXV. sq., with the archiepiscopal instruction, 1842, February, p. LXIV. sq. *Mailath*, The Religious Troubles in Hungary, Ratisbon, 1845, 2 vols.

to their children, but that Catholic priests were under no obligation to perform any sort of religious act in celebrating such marriages.[1]

There can be no question but that the Church in Austria would have reached a much higher degree of prosperity if the Governments of the Emperor Francis and his successor, *Ferdinand I.* (March 1, 1835; December 2, 1848), under the ministry of the all-powerful *Metternich*, had not impeded her free development by continual acts indicating a spirit of distrust, and by subjecting her to the restraints of the bureau of worship.[2]

Notwithstanding that the Catholic is the established religion of Austria, the Government, in 1821, gave ample evidence of its tolerant spirit by permitting Protestants to open a theological school, in which the principles of the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions[3] are taught. This school obtained the title and privileges of a faculty in 1850, and the right to confer the degree of doctorate in Protestant divinity.

§ 407. *The Catholic Church in Bavaria.*

Concordat and Constitutional Oath of the Catholics in Bavaria, Augsburg, 1847. Remarks on the New Concordat of Bavaria, compared to the Recent French and Former Bavarian Concordat of 1807, published in January, 1818. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. I., pp. 472-509. *Sepp*, Louis Augustus, King of Bavaria, Schaffhausen, 1869.

Few countries have been so deeply infected with the poison of a false philosophy, or have suffered so much from the folly of the *Illuminati*, as Bavaria towards the close of the last and the opening of the present century. Of this proofs have been already given.[4] Shortly after the opening of the reign of *Maximilian Joseph* (February 16, 1799), and chiefly through the influence of his First Minister, *Montgelas*, seventy religious foundations and abbeys were secularized; and, some time later, four hundred convents were closed and destroyed, churches were profaned and spoiled of their treasures, laws were enacted regulating worship, and sacrilegious hands were laid upon things the most holy. When, in 1807, after numerous delays and a deal of shifty conduct, Montgelas finally made up his mind to conclude a concordat with the Holy See through the Nuncio, *Della Genga*, Napoleon, with a view of impressing upon the Pope the fact that the Church could not get on except by conciliating him, stepped in and prevented further negotiations. Here the affair rested until 1816, when the Church in Bavaria was in so deplorable a condition that Pius VII. burst into tears in speaking of it.[5] Negotiations were again opened through the Bishop of Chersonese, Baron Haefelin, and

[1] *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, 1844, nro. 139, Suppl.

[2] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XXII.

[3] *Wenrich*, John Waechter as a Man, as a Servant of the State and the Church, Vienna, 1831, pp. 113-154.

[4] See § 392.

[5] *Gams*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 498, according to a Roman note of April 15, 1807. *Glücksohn*, "Bavaria under the Ministry of Montgelas," being several articles in the *Augs. Univ. Gaz.* of the year 1875.

Cardinal Consalvi, on the part of the Holy See, and again obstructed by the action of Montgelas, who claimed for the Government the right of appointing to *all* benefices, not even excepting parishes. The obnoxious minister was finally removed from office February 2, 1817, and on the 5th of June of the same year, after some further objections had been set aside, an arrangement was agreed upon and signed by the king on the 24th of October following. Notwithstanding that the Pope had made very ample concessions, the enemies of the Church were not satisfied, and, acting under the lead of *Von Feuerbach*, Governor of Ansbach, opposed the publication of the *concordat* until after the new *Constitution* should have been promulgated, because the latter not only contained paragraphs contradictory of the concordat, but also embodied the Edict of 1804, which was in spirit and drift Protestant, rather than Catholic. The bishops and the bulk of the priests now refused to take the oath to the Constitution until assured by the declaration of the king (September 15, 1821) that it did not bind them to any civil obligations, and implied nothing contrary to the laws of the Church. Still the Government officials continued to carry themselves as arbitrarily as ever, and to do great harm to the Church by their constant and growing interference with her administration. These circumstances gave peculiar weight and significance to the solemn advice of *Maximilian* to King *Louis*, on the accession of the latter to the throne in 1825: "*Guard and protect the faith*," said he, "*that Bavaria may again become what she was before she was led to betray her trust—the shield of religion and the corner-stone of the Church in Germany. Lift the Church from the bondage in which she is still held by those who distrust her without reason. Honour the priesthood to the end that the people may listen to their instructions and profit by them. Let neither priests nor libertines govern, and see that your kingdom be not the theatre either of empty pageants or the outbursts of democratic violence.*"[1] The lessons of heroism and devotion bequeathed to him by his ancestors of the Thirty Years' War were not lost upon Louis, who, as an evidence of his loyalty to his royal mission, had an equestrian statue erected to Maximilian in one of the public squares of Munich;[2] pleaded in favour of the Archbishop of Cologne, when that prelate was in difficulties, with the filial love of a child and the power of a king (after 1837); and promoted Catholic science by becoming the sympathetic and generous patron of *Görres* († January 29, 1848), *Phillips*, *Moy*, *Moehler*, *Klee*, *Doellinger*, *Haneberg*, *Reithmayr*, and many other able and brilliant writers. It was in this reign, also, whose auspicious opening gave promise of a more happy close than it had, that a *society* was formed *for the diffusion of wholesome Catholic*

[1] See *Görres'* remarkable memoir, entitled "*Prince Elector Maximilian to King Louis of Bavaria on the occasion of his accession to the Throne*" (*The Catholic*, 1825, Vol. XVIII., pp. 219-249.)

[2] Cfr. "The Equestrian Statue of Prince Elector Maximilian," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., pp. 449-454; and "Prince Elector Maximilian and Father *Dominic*," in the *Sion*, 1830, nro. 133, or op. Nov. 6.

books, such as should counteract the influence of the worthless and pernicious works of modern literature, and afford reading which, while recreating, would not poison the mind, and, while warming the heart, would not corrupt it; that Catholic *art*, inheriting the traditions of past ages, their majesty, sobriety, dignity, again revived; that ancient and decayed cathedrals were restored, the unfinished ones of Ratisbon, Bamberg, and Spire completed, and new churches built, which rival in architectural beauty and artistic decoration those of any other period. Among these may be mentioned the Basilica of St. Boniface, which is circular in form, and whose dome rests upon sixty-four monoliths of gray marble, and is resplendent with gold and frescoes; the cruciform church of St. Ludwig, embellished with Cornelius' fresco of the Last Judgment; the handsome Gothic church of Mariahilf, in the neighbouring district of Au, whose gorgeous windows of stained glass and exquisite specimens of wood-carving excite the admiration of every lover of the beautiful; and, finally, the Court Chapel of All Saints, which, apart from its architectural merits, contains a wealth of art-treasures. It was in this reign that painting renewed her ancient triumphs, and produced works which, under forms of fascinating beauty and surpassing loveliness, breathe a spirit of divine inspiration, and give fitting expression to those grand conceptions that fill the Christian mind. Then, too, the *episcopacy* was adorned by bishops (Sailer, Wittmann, and Schwäbl) who, by their vigilance, energy, and self-sacrifice, perpetuated the traditions of the saintly men who had filled the episcopal see of Ratisbon, and were now its enduring glory. *Bishops were again allowed the fullest freedom in their relations with the Holy See;*[1] the convents of the Carmelites, Capuchins, and Franciscans, conformably to the royal promises given in the concordat (art. VII.), were restored to their owners; the Brothers of Mercy and the Augustinian Friars were permitted to return; the Redemptorist Fathers (from 1842) and the Sisters of Charity again opened their houses; the Servites and *Benedictines*[2] were reinstated; the Sisters of the Schools entered upon their work of teaching, and the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd* set about reclaiming the erring and shielding those in danger from the temptations to which they were exposed.[3] Seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood were established, munificently endowed, and placed under the direction of men eminent alike for theological learning and priestly virtues.[4] Finally, an association (*Ludwig's*

[1] On the free intercourse of the Episcopacy of Bavaria with the Holy See, cf. *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., pp. 593-627.

[2] The documents concerning the foundation of the Benedictine establishments in the diocese of Augsburg are apud *Rheinwald*, Acta historico-ecclesiastica, anno 1835, p. 204 sq. See *The Bonn Review*, nro. 14, p. 238 sq.; nro. 18, p. 202 sq.

[3] On the establishment of this Order in the diocese of Munich, see *Sion*, 1839, nro. 64, Supplem., and the Statutes of the Order in *Sion*, 1840, nro. 134, Supplem.

[4] Cfr. *Wolf*, The Life and Influence of Louis I., King of Bavaria from 1786 to 1841 Augsburg, 1841.

Verein)[1] was founded, and received the royal approbation, for the conversion of unbelievers, both in *Asia* and *America* (from 1839).

Such was the consoling sight offered to the admiration of the faithful by a State as liberal to error as it was loyal to truth, and as sincerely tolerant as it was profoundly Catholic; which recognized and rewarded merit wherever found, whether among Catholics or Protestants,[2] and raised to positions of eminence all persons, regardless of religious profession, whom their contemporaries judged worthy of being so honoured. It will be sufficient to instance *Puchta*, the great civilian; *Stahl*, the celebrated canonist; *Rückert*, the Orientalist and lyric poet; and *Schelling*, the philosopher of identity.

§ 408. *The Catholic Church in Prussia.*

Theiner, Situation of the Catholic Church in Silesia, Ratisbon, 1852, 2 vols. *Gams*, L, c., Vol. I., p. 561. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of Germany, Vol. XI.; 2nd ed., Vol. VI.

The contrast between Catholic Bavaria and Protestant Prussia, as revealed by the light of modern history, is in many ways remarkable. In the former there was unity of science, unity of art, and unity of institutions; in the latter Catholics and Protestants were in unceasing conflict with each other. Inheriting the traditions of the House of Brandenburg, Prussia was the natural patron of Lutheranism; and though she ceased to be wholly Protestant after the accession of the Catholic provinces acquired by *Frederic II.*, she always continued the consistent foe of Catholicity, at one time attempting to merge it into Protestantism, at another to mould it after her own fashion; excluding Catholics from all offices of public trust, whether important or insignificant; preventing the free election of bishops and prelates and of abbots of chapters and convents"; introducing the spirit of Protestantism into the schools by craft, where that was possible, by violence where it was not; requiring the children born of mixed marriages to be brought up in the Protestant religion; in fine, giving the most complete and varied proof that the famous saying of Frederic II., "In my States one may go to heaven as he likes," was but a sonorous and meaningless phrase.[3]

[1] The Statutes are in *Sion*, 1839, nro. 11; Circulars in behalf of the Association, *ibid.*, nro. 64; Proposals made to the Society, *ibid.*, 1841, nro. 29; Project for the foundation of Mission-houses in Germany (*Catholic Sunday Papers* of Mentz, 1843, nro. 6.)

[2] Bishop Schwäbl's letter to Eberhard is in the Cath. and Eccl. Gaz. of *Hoenighaus*, 1841, nro. 47, June 10, and Eberhard's crafty answer in the 18th of July number. As to the new complaint of the Protestants against the *genuflexion* made by the *soldiery* before the Blessed Sacrament, see *Doellinger*, Letter to a Deputy, Munich, 1843. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XII., p. 744. *Ruland*, Series et vitæ professorum ss. Theol. qui Wirceburgi afundata academia (anno 1582) usque ad annum 1834 docuerunt, etc.; accedunt analecta ad hist. ejud. SS. Facultatis in quibus statuta antiqua divi Juli nondum edita., Wirceb., 1835.

[3] Cfr. The Relations of Frederic the Great to the Catholic Church (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I., pp. 321-338). Cfr., besides. Frederic William III.'s letter to his relative, the Duchess of Koethen, on the occasion of her own and her husband's return to the Catholic Church, and likewise several of his declarations hostile towards the Catholic Church. See *The Catholic*, 1826, Vol. XXI., pp. 1-22; Vol. XXII., p. 206 sq., and 1826 Suppl. to January number, p. XIV.; Suppl. to April number, p. XI. sq.; Suppl. to July number, pp. I.-V.

Frederic William III. (1797-1840) pursued the same policy during his reign, and slightly improved upon it; for, the better to realize his plans and attain his end, which was to replace Catholic institutions wherever they existed by others Protestant in spirit and form, he adopted the theories of *Hegel* on State supremacy.[1] The result of this long, persistent, and perfidious policy of oppression was at first to deaden the energy of faith among true believers, but, as time went on, to call it again into life, and to rouse feelings of resistance.

In 1821, *Prince Hardenberg* hastily terminated the negotiations commenced at Rome by *Niebuhr* and *Consalvi*, and the bull *De Salute Animarum*, which was their outcome, marked the opening of a new era for Catholics. One of the immediate results of this important bull was the reorganization of the archbishopric of Cologne and of the bishoprics of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn, in the Rhenish provinces; of the archbishopric of Gnesen and Posen and the bishopric of Ermeland; and the endowment of the Prussian chapters. *Niebuhr*, though an enemy to the Court of Rome, and believing Catholicity to be essentially hostile to the country he represented, nevertheless put aside his prejudices for the time, and, during his residence as ambassador at Rome, adjusted the existing differences in a way honourable to his character as a man, and creditable to his reputation as a diplomatist. They were, however, again revived some time later by *Bunsen*, the Prussian Chargé d'Affairs at Rome,[2] and settled with the utmost difficulty. The religious controversies originating in Prussia, whence they spread through all Germany, and thence across the ocean to another continent, may be accounted for by the following reasons: 1. Catholicity and Protestantism are, from the nature of their respective claims, essentially opposed to each other; 2. The claims of the Church and the claims of the civil authority will necessarily conflict where kings are absolute, because she has ever resisted and must continue to resist any and all attempts to take away her independence, and to interfere in the government of her internal affairs;[3] 3. And this reason is more special, the essential negative character of which Protestantism cannot divest itself.

Moreover, Protestant ideas generally acquired unusual preponderance and prestige after the celebration of the Reformation Jubilee in 1817, and in counteracting these *Moehler's Symbolism* largely contributed, and produced a powerful effect on the faith and conscience of Catholics.

[1] The *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, August 7, 1841; "Hegelianism and Christianity in Prussia" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 81-91), and "German Letters" (*Ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 1 sq., and especially nro. V); "Prussia's Relations to the Church, Past and Present" (*Ibid.*, Vol. X., pp. 665-681); *William von Schütz*, "Canon Law in the Rhenish Provinces," Würzburg, 1841. *Laspeyres*, History and Actual Organization of Catholicism in Prussia, Vol. I., Halle, 1839.

[2] Cfr. *Niebuhr's* Correspondence, Hamburgh, 1839. See also Niebuhr and Bunsen as Diplomats at Rome (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. V., p. 270 sq., 397 sq., 531 sq.)

[3] Cfr. The Overweening Tendency of the Temporal Power to Encroach upon the Government of the Church, in the *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1831, pp. 1-43; State of Catholicity in Prussia (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., p. 239 sq., 291 sq.)

Previously, however, to the reorganization of the ecclesiastical province of the Lower Rhine, other events had transpired of great utility to the Church in Prussia. Thus, for example, by the establishment of the new *University of Bonn*, a faculty of Catholic theology was given to the Rhenish provinces; in 1818 the *Lyceum Hosianum* was reopened in the diocese of Ermeland; and "grand seminaries" were founded in other dioceses. Again, in 1834, the *Academy of Münster* was permitted to exercise the privileges granted in former ages by emperors and popes, and was thus in a position to reward merit by conferring such titles and dignities as were in its power to give.

The Catholic population of the provinces recently annexed to Prussia, who were never quite reconciled to their new masters, frequently protested against the military regulations, by which the Catholic portion of the army were not only deprived of all spiritual ministrations by their own priests, but forced to attend Protestant service[1] once in the month, and against the unjust discrimination by Government in making appointments to professorships in universities, to tutorships in schools, and to judgeships in the courts. The publicity given to these grievances through the Press tended to make the Catholics look with suspicion upon the policy of the Government. The individual instances were collected and published under the apparently inoffensive title of "*Documents to Serve for a Church History of the Nineteenth Century*,"[2] to which was added an opinion given by *Claussen*, Provost of the Collegiate Chapter of Aix-la-Chapelle, relative to the execution of the brief of Pius VIII., addressed to the Rhenish bishops, on *mixed marriages*. This memorial, which gave a catalogue of the grievances suffered by Catholics, and charged the Prussian Government, among other things, with having influenced the *election of bishops*, was productive of very important results.

The elevation of *Clement Augustus de Droste* to the archbishopric of Cologne took place at the very time when other complicated events of unusual gravity were transpiring. While Vicar-General of the diocese of Münster, Droste had had a serious misunderstanding with the Government on the subject of ecclesiastical studies;[3] and to render his position still more delicate, he was now placed over a see whose last incumbent, Count *Ferdinand Spiegel*, had favoured the teaching of *Hermes*, which had been condemned by the Holy See, September 25, 1835, because of its rationalistic and Pelagian tendencies, and of its erroneous treatment of Catholic dogmas. Archbishop Droste, being long known as an outspoken enemy of the

[1] Order of the Cabinet, issued on the 2nd of February, 1810, apud *Rintel*, Defence of Martin de Dunin, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, p. 120; Essay, &c., p. 80 sq.

[2] Essays on the Ch. H. of the Nineteenth Century, Augsburg, 1835, usually styled the "*Red Book*." See the answer headed, The Catholic Church in the Rhenish Province of Prussia and Archbishop Clement Augustus of Cologne, Frankfort, 1838. (*Ellendorf*), The Cath. Church in Prussia, Rudolstadt, 1837.

[3] For documents, consult the *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1820, p. 511 sq.

system of Hermes, felt now that there was on many accounts a call upon him to prevent its spread among the younger clergy, and he therefore drew up eighteen propositions, chiefly directed against the Hermesian doctrines, which he required those preparing to take Orders, and some chaplains about to become pastors, to subscribe under oath before being advanced to their new honours. For a similar reason, the archbishop suspended some of the professors at the University of Bonn and the Seminary of Cologne, and silenced others. The Government now took umbrage at the archbishop's conduct, chiefly on two grounds: first, because he had acted without consulting it; and, second, because the propositions, but notably the *eighteenth*, infringed the rights of the State;[1] and, having consulted some ecclesiastics of the *school of Hermes*, who, being *interested* parties, gave a necessarily biassed judgment on the character of the propositions,[2] ordered the archbishop to reconsider his action, threatening him with various penalties if he should refuse. On the Hermesian question the Government showed a disposition to yield. It intimated to the archbishop that his wishes might be carried out if his forms and methods of procedure were somewhat modified, adding that such modifications would tend more certainly to secure his end. But on the question of *mixed marriages*, which it regarded as of vastly more importance, it demanded a corresponding concession on the part of the archbishop.

Count Ferdinand Spiegel, the predecessor of Clement Augustus, had seriously compromised the reputation acquired by his many services to the diocese of Cologne, by addressing to his Vicars-General a *Convention*, accompanied by an *instruction on mixed marriages* (1834), wholly inconsistent with the tenor of the brief of *Pius VIII.*, with which, however, it was represented to Clement Augustus *as being in complete harmony*.[3]

---

[1] "I solemnly promise to obey my archbishop in whatever relates to doctrine and discipline; to respect and obey him, without any mental reservation; and I pledge myself, conformably to the spirit of the Hierarchy, not to appeal from the decision of my archbishop to anyone other than the Pope, the Head of the Universal Church."

[2] Some of these opinions appeared in print, e.g., that which is headed Responsum sedecim prioribus earum thesium, quæ sub titulo: "Theses neoapprobandis et aliis presbyteris Archidiœceseos Colon. ad subscribendum propositæ," innotuerunt, in serm. latin. conversum edendum curavit P. Q., Darmstadt, 1837, which translation was made upon the publication of Göttingen, 1837.

[3] It should be borne in mind that even before the occupation of *Silesia* by Prussia the question of mixed marriages had there been raised. Cfr. the Essay entitled Conduct of the Prince Bishops and Vicars-General of Breslau with Respect to Mixed Marriages from 1709 to 1743 (*Sion*, 1841, nro. 114, Sept. 19, Supplement). This elaborate essay contains important documents. The Catholics (says the Protestant, *Chas. Hase*, in his Ch. H., p. 636) had been in the habit of applying to the case of Protestants the long-established usage condemning all marriages with heretics. But, after the Thirty Years' War, the custom of mixed marriages had become established among the people. According to ordinary German usage, where no marriage compact determined the matter otherwise, the children were educated according to the faith of the parent with whom they corresponded in sex. A peculiar legislation, based on the principle of a certain legal equality, was gradually formed in the different States on this subject, with respect to which nothing was said by the Roman authorities. In Prussia the common law was so changed that, where the unanimous wish of the parents was not opposed to it, the children were required to be educated in the church of the father. By an order of the Cabinet, issued in

In his brief *Venerabiles fratres*, Pius VIII. had lamented his inability to remove the difficulties surrounding the bishops of the Rhenish provinces, and to harmonize the laws of the Church on mixed marriages with the royal decree of 1825, relative to the education of children born of such unions; whereas the instruction of Spiegel represented that the ecclesiastical discipline on mixed marriages had been so modified that there was no longer any obstacle to prevent obedience to the Cabinet order of 1825.

While Archbishop *Spiegel signed the Convention unconditionally*, making no provision for papal approbation, Chevalier *Bunsen*, acting within his instructions from the Prussian Government, *specially stipulated that it should not be valid unless it received the royal sanction.* After placing the Convention and the Instruction beside the brief of Pius VIII., and finding, *upon close examination*, that both of them were *in disaccord* with it, Clement Augustus expressed his determination of following the teachings of the Pope in all instances in which the Institution of his predecessor deviated from them, saying that he did not wish, like the late Bishop of Treves, to retract on his death-bed what he should never have done during his life. After so decided an expression by the archbishop of the line of conduct he meant to pursue, all thoughts of an accommodation vanished. The archbishop continued steadfast, the Government obstinate, and, in consequence, affairs came to a crisis. The courageous pastor of Cologne was forcibly dragged from his archiepiscopal see and cast into prison, November 20, 1837, and finally shut up in the fortress of *Minden*, on the alleged charges, as stated in the ministerial decree, of having broken his word, undermined the laws, and, by rousing the passions of the people, divided them into two revolutionary parties. This act of violence created a profound impression among all Catholics, evoking feelings of indignant sorrow, which were intensified by the foul calumnies with which the unimpeachable character of the archbishop was aspersed. Contrary to what had been anticipated, the Pope was not the least frightened by this malignant persecution, and, while preserving his serene dignity, exhibited an unusal degree of firmness and courage. On the 10th of December, 1837, he published an *Allocution*, in which he protested before the whole civilized world against these outrages, perpetrated by the enemies of the Church, closing in the following words: "We declare to-day, solemnly and publicly, what we have always held privately, though we have never before expressed it openly, viz., that we disapprove and condemn all practices introduced into the kingdom of Prussia, so far as these conflict with the true sense of our predecessor's instructions on the subject of mixed marriages." These words produced a deep impression on *Martin of Dunin*,[1] Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, who, as early as January, 1837, and *without any knowledge of the events transpiring at Cologne*, had expressed his doubts to the Government as to the legality of the practices followed in mixed marriages, which obtained to some extent in his diocese, requesting that, in order to their correction, he might be allowed either to publish the brief addressed by Pope Pius VIII. to the Rhenish bishops, to apply to the Holy See for a decision of the question, or, finally, to comply with the instructions of the bull *Magnæ nobis admirationis*[2] of Benedict XIV., which was still in force. As none of these proposals were accepted, the archbishop, on the 21st of October, 1837, addressed his request directly to the king, who not only refused to grant it, but on the 30th of December following gave his approval to a ministerial measure, whose drift ran directly counter to the archbishop's proposition. The archbishop was further informed that, *notwithstanding the Papal Allocution of December 10th*, no change should be made in the existing practice. The archbishop had now to choose between the commands of the king and the instructions of the Pope, and convinced that in a matter of this kind he was in conscience bound to obey the *latter* rather than the former, contrary to the royal will, he published in February, 1838, a *stringent* Pastoral Letter, embodying the teaching of the bull of Benedict XIV., in which he pronounced sentence of suspension on any priest who from that time forth should solemnize a mixed marriage without having first obtained ample guarantees that the children born of it should be

---

1825, this requisition was extended to the province of the Rhine, and to Westphalia, by declaring that any obligations of betrothed persons to the contrary were not binding, and any requirements made as conditions of the marriage rite by the Church were unlawful. But the ceremony of marriage, without a promise that the children should be educated in the Catholic faith, had previously been performed frequently in Eastern and rarely in Western Prussia. (Tr.)

[1] †*Pohl*, Martin of Dunin, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, being a Biographica Sketch, Marienburg, 1843.

[2] See p. 104.

brought up in the Catholic religion. By the Government, the Pastoral was declared null and void; protection was promised to all priests who would disobey its instructions; and the archbishop himself was arraigned before the Superior Court of Posen on the charge of disobedience and high treason. While *denying the competence* of the court, the archbishop obeyed the summons to go *to Berlin*. Negotiations were again tried, but resulted in nothing, and in April, 1839, a judicial sentence was rendered, declaring the archbishop guilty of disobedience, deposing him from his office, and condemning him to imprisonment in a fortress for a term of six months. After his release, he again attempted to bring about an understanding, but in vain; and, having returned to his diocese without the king's leave, and against his will, was again arrested and confined in the fortress of Colberg.

The persecution suffered by these two venerable prelates excited the sympathies of the whole Catholic world, and in Germany *caused a reaction in favour of the Catholic Church* more loyal, outspoken, and enthusiastic than had been known for many years. The clergy of the diocese of Gnesen and Posen gave proof of their fidelity to the Church and their attachment to their archbishop by *unanimously protesting* against the interference of the civil authority in *spiritual* affairs, and against the course pursued by the Government towards the chief of their diocese. Thirteen American bishops, assembled in *Provincial Council at Baltimore*, sent a letter of condolence (dated May 20, 1840), expressed their deep veneration for these two noble confessors of the faith.[1] With the exception of *Sedlnitzky, Prince-Bishop of Breslau*, who, owing to the difficulties of his position, resigned his see in August, 1840,[2] and died an apostate at Berlin in 1871, all the bishops of Prussia pursued the same course as the two archbishops in regard to mixed marriages.

The accession of *Frederic William IV.* to the throne of Prussia, June 7, 1840, revived the drooping hopes of the Catholics, who seemed to feel confident that this prince would bring the disagreeable business to a speedy close. Viewing the question in its true light, and without allowing his judgment to be warped by the clamours and sophisms of the Press, Frederic William at once set about adjusting

[1] For the Latin original, see Concilia Provincialia Baltimore habita, ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849, p. 180 sq. Cf. *Sion*, 1840, July number, p. 874.

[2] Statement of the Conduct of the Prussian Government in relation to the Archbishop of Cologne, by *Moy*, Berlin, 1838. This work considers the conduct of the Government from a historical, legal, and political point of view. *Roman* Memorial of March 4, 1838, issued from the office of the Secretary of State (Germ., Augsburg, 1838). *Joseph von Görres*, Athanasius, Ratisbon, 1838. 4 editions. Shortly after there appeared: The Imprisonment of the Archbishop of Cologne, by a Jurisconsult (*Lieber*), Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1837, 1838, 3 pts. *J. J. Döllinger*, Mixed Marriages, Ratisbon, 1838, of which there are five editions. *Jos. von Görres*, The Triarians, H. Leo, Drs. Marheinecke and Bruno, Ratisbon, 1838. *J. J. Ritter*, Irenicon, Lipsiæ, 1840. *Kuntsmann* and *Kutschker*, Mixed Marriages, see p. 105, note 1. *Second Allocution* of the Pope, of the 13th of September, 1838; the Answer, in the *State Gazette* of Prussia, December 31, 1838; the Rejoinder of the Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, dated January 5, 1839 (*Polit. Gaz. of Munich*, February 1, 1839, and *Sion*); State Paper, published at Rome, in answer to the *Prussian Gazette* of December 31, 1838. Cfr. the Legal Opinions and Pleadings in favour of the Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, by *William von Schütz* and *Rintel*, and several essays of *Guido Görres* and *Phillips*, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I.-V. *Chas. Hase*, The Two Archbishoprics, being a Fragment of Contemporary History, Lps., 1839. *Bretschneider*, Baron of Sandau, or Mixed Marriages, 3rd edit., Halle, 1839. *Goetz*, Baron of Wiesau, being an Offset to Baron of Sandau, Ratisbon, 1839. See also the bibliography given in *Rheinwald's* Repertory, years 1838 and 1839, and Autobiography of Count *Sedlnitzky*, Berlin, 1872, and *Brück*, Ch. H., p. 753.

the relations between Church and State, and authorized *Mgr. Dunin* to return to the faithful of his diocese (June 29, 1840),[1] who had never ceased to deplore his absence and to pray that he might soon be back again. Immediately on his return, the archbishop issued a pastoral to his clergy (Aug. 27, 1840), advising them to cultivate peaceful relations with non-Catholics, adding that, since the civil law forbade them to exact guarantees requiring the children born of mixed marriages to be brought up in the Catholic faith, they should carefully abstain from doing aught that might give colour of sanction to such unions. Nearly two years later (March, 1842) he reminded the clergy, inasmuch as they were the ministers of peace whose office was not to ruin but to save souls, to avoid all public denunciation; to hear the confessions, when required, of those who had married outside the Church, and to administer the sacraments to them when sick and desiring reconciliation; because, said he, the mercy of God surpasseth the perversity of man.[2] The archbishop (December 26, 1842) was the more ready to make these concessions, since the king daily gave fresh proofs of his good will towards the Church and of his desire to restore to her her freedom. That the archbishop's confidence was not a mistaken one was soon proved by a series of royal acts of unusual liberality. By a decree of January 1, 1841, the king surrendered his claim to the royal *placet* in spiritual affairs, and granted to bishops the *fullest freedom* in their *intercourse with the Holy See;* and, by a second, of February 12 of the same year, he *established a Catholic department* in the ministry of Public Worship. The satisfactory settlement of the affairs of Cologne is also to be ascribed to the conciliatory temper of the king.[3] Acting in accord with arrangements made at Rome by Count Brühl, the King of Bavaria authorized Mgr. *de Geissel*, Bishop of Spire, a firm yet prudent man, to leave his kingdom and become coadjutor to Clement Augustus, in the diocese of Cologne, with the right of succession. The King of Prussia, on his part, publicly avowed that he had never believed the reports connecting the name of the occupant of the see of Cologne with political and revolutionary intrigues. When this prelate was dragged from his diocese and carried off to Minden, a proclamation severely reflecting upon his character was published, which was soon openly withdrawn by Bodelschwing, the first President.

Feeling that ample and honourable satisfaction had been done him, *Clement Augustus* now voluntarily resigned the administration of his diocese. "From now until the hour of my death," said he in a

[1] Return of the Archbishop to Gnesen and Posen (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 428-442). *Hase*, L. c., p. 253.

[2] The first Pastoral Letter is in the *Sion*, 1840, nro. 111, in Latin and in German, p 117. As to the second, see *The Catholic*, 1842, June number, Suppl., p. CIX. sq.

[3] *Jos. von Görres*, Church and State on the termination of the Cologne Troubles, Weissenfels on the Saale, 1842. Shortly thereafter appeared "Peace between Church and State," a work written with reference to the well-known Berlin Exposition, by *Clement Augustus*, Münster, 1843.

touching letter,[1] taking farewell of his flock, "I shall not cease to lift up my hands to heaven, as Moses did of old, and by my fervent prayers draw down the blessings of the Almighty upon my people." He died, October 19, 1845. The king continued to show tokens of his good-will towards the diocese of Cologne, for, besides giving large sums himself to aid in completing the magnificent cathedral of that city, he also made an appeal to the whole Christian world to send contributions for the same purpose.[2]

§ 409. *The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine.* (Cf. § 396.)

Essays on the contemporaneous History of Catholicity in Germany, by *J. M. L. R . . . s*, Strasburg, 1823. *Lang*, Collection of the Ordinances of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1835. By the *same*, Collection of Catholic Church-laws, in Würtemberg, Tübingen, 1836. **State of Catholicity* in Baden, Ratisbon, 1841-1843, 2 pts. Answer by *Mebenius*, under the same title, Carlsruhe, 1842. *Friedberg*, The State and the Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Lps. 1871. †*Longner*, The Relations of the Bishops, from a Legal Point of View, in the Dioceses of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1840. By the **same*, Historical Essays on the Eccl. Province of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1863. *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchism, p. 813 sq. †*Brück*, The Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Mentz, 1868. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., "Reflections on the Eccl. and Polit. Situation of Baden." *Gams*, L. cit., T. I., pp. 405-472.

By the act of secularization of 1803, the accession of Catholic subjects to the Protestant Governments of *Würtemberg* and *Baden* was so considerable as to form in the former country one-third, and in the latter two-thirds of the entire population. But the rights of Catholics were not on this account more respected. As in Prussia and Bavaria, so also here the Church was fettered by edicts of religion and special ordinances, thus subjecting her to the vexatious control of a State bureau. For example, by an order of the Government of Würtemberg, dated March 20, 1803, every ecclesiastical document published after that date should bear at the head of it the words, "*By royal authority*," to the end, it was said, "that the clergy might feel secure." This order was renewed on the 11th of June following, and all persons infringing it declared liable to severe punishment. Again, on the 2nd of March, 1805, it was decreed "that all dispensations from fasting given by the bishop and all ecclesiastical documents whatever should bear the *placet* of the Government; that no feast or divine service of any kind should be celebrated in the churches on any day except Sundays; and that on week-days labour should take the place of church-going." The *Crown* was declared to have the *right of appointment to ecclesiastical benefices*, which were in consequence disposed of by a Royal Ecclesiastical Council, before which candidates for position were to make competitive examinations. This council had also complete control of studies, and *all petitions for dispensations from the impediments to marriage* had to be submitted to it. The property, both movable and real, of the monasteries was, here as elsewhere, plundered and squandered; religious were insulted and otherwise ill treated; and the Catholics of Upper Baden so systematically excluded from all offices of public trust that Napoleon, as Protector of the Rhenish Confederation, sent a threatening note to the Badish Government, protesting against the policy "of shutting out Catholics and the inhabitants of the countries recently annexed to Baden from participation in public affairs and offices of State," and complaining "that Mannheim, Freiburg, and other important towns had been stripped of institutions which were of a character to contribute to their prosperity and splendour." It is hardly necessary to add that the note received immediate attention. The Grand Duke *Charles Frederic* nominated *Baron von Andlaw*, a zealous Catholic, his Minister of the Interior, in March, 1810. The

[1] The letter of the Prussian king to Clement Augustus is found in *The Catholic*, 1842, February number, Suppl., p. LXX. sq. Clement Augustus' Valedictory in *The Catholic*, 1842, May number, Suppl., p. LXIII. sq. The *Coadjutor's* Pastoral Letter in the *Sion*, 1842, March number. *Stoeveken*, The Life, Works, ard Death of Clement Augustus, described for the German People, Mentz, 1846.

[2] The *Catholic Journal* of Cologne gives an account of an association founded in Mexico, in answer to the appeal of the Prussian king, to aid in completing the cathedral.

ecclesiastical authorities, presiding over the Catholics of the newly-annexed territories, resided at *Constance*, *Würzburg*, and *Bruchsal*.

The Vicar-General, Von Wessenberg, lived at Constance, of which he was subsequently appointed Coadjutor by Archbishhop Dalberg. While many of his measures were beneficial, others were extremely injurious to the interests of the Church, and drew forth complaints, not alone from the Pope (February, 1810), but also from the Government of Freiburg and the King of Würtemberg himself. To correct the harm done in his kingdom by Von Wessenberg, the king published a decree in 1811, stating, "that owing to the arbitrary measures of the clergy of the second rank, who, by abolishing the Latin language in the divine service, had spread discord from village to village, destroyed uniformity of worship, and unsettled the consciences of the people, he ordered that the Latin language should be retained where it was still used, and restored where it had been discontinued, and that no change should be made in ancient rites and established customs."[1] Von Wessenberg, however, was still in a position to do harm. His influence was all-powerful in the *Permanent Catholic Commission*, established at Carlsruhe in 1803, which in 1812, was changed into the *Department for Catholic Worship*, and among whose ecclesiastical members were *Brunner*, a Catholic of advanced views, and *Haeberlein*, an advocate of the abolition of clerical celibacy. After the death of George Charles of Fechenbach, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, that portion of his diocese lying within the territory of Baden was transferred, in 1808, by Archbishop Dalberg to the jurisdiction of the Vicar-General of Bruchsal. Here, as in Bavaria, *Napoleon* secretly interfered to prevent the erection of bishoprics, which the Governments of Baden and Würtemberg, acting in good faith, contemplated establishing in 1807 and 1808. He also objected to the presence of the Nuncio, *Della Genga*, in Germany, and prevailed upon the Pope to send him to Paris. As early as the 12th of September, 1807, *Count de Champagny*, Minister to the emperor, sent a peremptory note to Cardinal Caprara, stating "that the emperor, as Protector of the Rhenish Confederation, must necessarily take an interest in the religious affairs of that great country;" "that he therefore desired to have the negotiations for the concordat with Germany carried on under his own eyes at Paris;" and, he added, with simulated sorrow, that the emperor was not a little grieved to know "that the Pope had given no attention to the complaints of the churches of Germany, which for the last ten years he had wholly neglected." The fact was that, owing to the supremacy of the State, the intense bigotry of the Protestants, who were at the head of affairs, and Von Wessenberg's betrayal of the true interests of religion, the Catholic Church had been as nearly ruined as it well could in the Grand Duchy of Baden.

In *Würtemberg*, thanks to the solicitous care of King Frederic, *Ellwangen* was made the residence of a Vicar-General, and Francis Charles, Prince of Hohenlohe, Bishop of Tempe, was appointed to that office in 1812. With the consent of Archbishop Dalberg, that portion of the diocese of Augsburg lying within the territory of Würtemberg was cut off from his province, a division which the Holy See finally sanctioned (March 21, 1816). About the same time, that is, October 30, 1812, a *Catholic University* was founded at Ellwangen, which, however, the Catholic students of divinity of Würtemberg were alone permitted to frequent. Some time later, in 1817, it was incorporated in the University of Tübingen, under the name of the Faculty of Catholic Theology, and the residence of the Vicar-General transferred to *Rottenburg*. By the death of the Prince-Primate, *Charles Theodore de Dalberg*, Archbishop of Ratisbon, February 10, 1817, the two sees of Constance and Worms, to which the Catholics of the Grand Duchy of Baden and the Kingdom of Würtemberg were subject, fell vacant, thus giving rise to fresh difficulties for the Catholics of these countries. It was now determined to put an end to the unsettled state of affairs, and accordingly representatives from the *Protestant Governments* of Würtemberg, Baden, the two Hesses, Nassau, Mecklenburg, the Duchies of Saxony, Oldenburg, Waldeck, Lübeck, Bremen, Frankfort, and Hamburg met at *Frankfort-on-the-Main*, March 24, 1818, to take steps towards an arrangement with the Holy See. Judging from the opening speech of *Baron von Wangenheim* the representative from Würtemberg, in which the attitude of the Protestant princes towards the Pope was clearly indicated, the Catholics began to fear that no good would come of the Conference. Their suspicions were fully borne out by the subsequent proceedings of the Conference, which adopted as the *basis* of negotiations with the Holy See the principles set forth in the Punctuation of Ems and the establishment of a *National Church in Germany*. The conditions of the

[1] It is proper to say that Archbishop Dalberg had issued a *Pastoral*, during the absence of Wessenberg at the Congress of Vienne, condemning the ordinances of his Vicar-General (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. II., year 1867, p. 441 sq.)

Conference, which were embodied in a document bearing the title of *Magna Charta Libertatis Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Romanæ*, and presented by the representatives from Würtemberg and Baden, were declined by the Holy See. Negotiations were again opened at Frankfort, and fresh proposals sent to Rome, which resulted in the publication, August 16, 1821, of the bull *Provida solersque* by Pius VII., providing for the establishment of the *Archbishopric of Freiburg* and the suffragan sees of *Rottenburg, Mentz, Fulda,* and *Limburg*.[1] Relying upon the wisdom of the princes, whose interests were at stake, the Pope had entertained hopes that some understanding might be arrived at relative to other questions, on which no definite action had yet been taken. He was at first disappointed, and there were indications that what had already been accomplished might be again undone. This uneasiness arose from the fact that he could not grant canonical institution to the candidates selected by the Protestant princes to fill the newly-created sees. One of these, *Baron von Wessenberg*, was particularly objectionable. Having been Coadjutor to Archbishop de Dalberg at Constance, he was elected Vicar-Capitular on the death of that prelate, but Rome, for grave and sufficient reasons, declined to confirm his election (b. March 15, 1817; d. August, 1860).[2] The truth of the matter was that the Holy See had received information that the candidates had pledged themselves in general terms to adhere to the principles set forth by the State in the *Ecclesiastical Pragmatia*,[3] condemned in Rome in 1819. The negotiations thus abruptly broken off were not resumed again until the pontificate of *Leo XII.*, who, in view of the peculiar circumstances of the country, published on the 11th of April, 1827, the bull *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam*,[4] giving directions as to the mode of electing bishops in future and of giving information concerning the candidates; as to the constitution of chapters and the appointment of their members; as to seminaries and free intercourse with Rome; and, finally, as to the exercise of episcopal rights. In consequence of this bull, *Bernard Boll*, the *first Bishop of Freiburg*, whither the see had been transferred from Constance, became the *first* archbishop and metropolitan of the Province of the Upper Rhine, and as such took possession of the majestic cathedral of Freiburg on the 21st of October, 1827. About eighteen months later, May 19, 1829, the *Bishop of Rottenburg* was similarly installed in his see. It had been agreed that the relations of Church and State, *the provisions for their harmonious action*, the degree of *supervision to be exercised by the civil authority over the Church*, and the manner of *protecting* her spiritual interests should be arranged by the *common* consent of the Government interested; but they withheld the publication of the ordinance relating to these affairs until after the Pope had appointed to the five vacant sees. After much discussion and the requiring and giving pledges on both sides, these appointments were finally made; and on the 30th of January, 1830, an ordinance embracing *thirty-nine articles*[5] was published, in which was reproduced the *Ecclesiastical Pragmatia*, already condemned by the Pope, which deprived the Church of every shred of real freedom, and subjected all her acts to the inspection and *placet* of the police. *Baron von Hornstein* made an able argument against the ordinance in the Chamber of Würtemberg, showing conclusively that its articles were cruelly unjust and prejudicial to the interests of the Church. Pope *Pius VIII.* also protested, rebuking the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine for keeping silent, when they should have spoken out, declaring, like the

---

[1] The bull may be found in the work named at the head of § 397. *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 322 sq.

[2] The Holy See would not confirm this election, because the true sentiments of the prelate with regard to the Church had become manifest from the measures adopted by him while Coadjutor of the diocese of Constance. Were demonstrative proof of the suspicions already entertained required, it might be found in Wessenberg's own "History of the Councils of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." A criticism of this history, by *Hefele*, may be found in the Eccl. Paper of South Germany, 1841, nros. 32, 33, and 38. Making every allowance for the author of this work, it is difficult to understand what he means by the assertion that the Jesuits confounded Christianity with the Church, unless that he would prefer Christianity without a Church. See his work, Vol. IV., p. 377. For the history of his episcopate, see "Essay on Catholicity in the Grand Duchy of Baden," p. 30 sq. (Note of French Tr.)

[3] The Ecclesiastical Pragmatia for the Eccl. Province of the Upper Rhine, with notes by *L. Wolf*, Würzburg, 1823. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. IV., p. 412 sq.

[4] This bull is given in *Walter*, Canon Law, Fontes juris ecclesiastici, p. 335 sq.

[5] They are found, *ibid.*, p. 340 sq., and in the *Tübing Quart. Review*, 1830, p. 162 sq.

apostles, that they must obey God rather than man.[1] The worst apprehensions of both the Catholics and the Roman Pontiff were more than verified, for the very men who had conceived, drawn up, and caused the publication of the ordinance were now entrusted with its execution. By this arrangement the Church was made in some sort a branch of the ministry of the interior and of worship, and, as a consequence, ecclesiastical dignitaries were little more than civil functionaries, dependent upon the administrative authority. In this way the Church in the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine was stripped of all freedom and deprived of all independence.[2] From having been a patron, the State now became an oppressor of the Church, and so tyrannical were its acts that Archbishop Boll, one of the most peaceful and tolerant of men, was forced, as his life drew to a close, to resign the government of his diocese. He had in vain petitioned the ministry and besought the Grand Duke to have certain professors, appointed by Government, removed from their positions, because of their false teaching. One of these, *Reichlin-Meldegg*, represented the history of the Church as a romance, and denied the divinity of Christ, while giving a course of lectures on *Catholic* theology at the University of Freiburg ;[3] and another, *Schreiber*, the professor of moral theology at the same place, assailed the prerogatives of virginity, and argued against the obligation of priestly celibacy.

That the religious controversy, which originated in Prussia in 1837, and spread thence over the whole Catholic world, should have been taken up in a country whose faith had been so ably defended by the immortal *Moehler*, was not only natural, but, under the circumstances, necessary. Although the Church in Würtemberg was *less free*, and, in the matter of *mixed marriages*, more embarrassed than even in Prussia, she was not wholly without hope and comfort. Among the younger clergy, particularly, there began to appear signs of a reaction against the claims of the Government to interfere in spiritual affairs (*jus in sacra*). When an order from the Government appeared requiring the removal of all priests who refused to celebrate marriages according to the instructions of the law of 1806, by which both parties were placed on a precisely equal footing, *Bishop Keller of Rottenburg*, an old and tried servant of the Government, was ordered to bring in a bill in the Lower Chamber (November 13, 1841), demanding the recognition of the *right of the Church to govern herself*—a right guaranteed her by the constitution.[4] The

---

[1] It is said in the Brief addressed to the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine (*Walter*, Fontes, p. 345; *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1830, p. 787): "Vestrum enim omnino erat ea sedulo præstare, quæ tanta verborum gravitate Paulus Apost. Timotheo discipulo suo et ejus persona Episcopis omnibus inculcat, cum ait: Prædica verbum, insta opportune, importune, argue, obsecra, increpa in omni patientia et doctrina, etc. . . . Tu vero vigila, in omnibus labora, opus fac Evangelistæ, ministerium tuum imple. Vestrum erat, vocem tollere pastoralem, ita ut errantium castigatio esset simul fræno ac timori vacillantibus, juxta illud ejusdem Apostoli: Peccantes coram omnibus argue, ut et cæteri timorem habeant. Denique Vestrum erat, exemplum imitari Apostolorum, qui silentium indicentibus evangelica libertate responderunt: Obedire oportet Deo magis, quam hominibus.

[2] Cfr. *The Catholic*, 1839, February number, pp. 147-159.

[3] *Ketteler*, Bishop of Mentz, The Rights and Safeguards of the Catholic Church in Germany, pp. 26-31. *Brück*, Ch. H., p. 736. (Tr.)

[4] An enumeration of the chief points in the bishop's *bill* will enable us to estimate how grievously the Church was persecuted. (*The Catholic*, 1842, February number, Supplement, p. XC. sq.) For the maintenance of the liberty of the Church, he demanded: 1. That the bishop should have the supreme direction and superintendence of his clergy. In virtue of another bill, introduced on behalf of the Government by *Von Jaumann*, Dean of the Cathedral and an ex-member of the notorious Frankfort Commission, this direction was limited so as to imply no more than a zealous watchfulness. If, for example, an ecclesiastic was to be suspended, the suspension must come *first* from an Ecclesiastical Council, and *next from his ordinary*. The bill demanded: 2. That the manner of conferring benefices should be corrected, as in no other country was so great a disregard shown for the principles of the Church in this matter. 3. That the bishop should have the administration of all ecclesiastical property and contingent resources of the Church, an affair with which the Ecclesiastical Council had dealt in the most summary manner. 4. That deaneries should be visited only by the bishop or those whom he deputed, and not, as was the custom, by one commissioner representing the bishop and another the Government. 5. That since the Catholic Church, although tolerating mixed

bishop, in his speech, supporting this motion, brought forward the most irrefragable arguments, but to no purpose. The bill was thrown out in both houses; one of the members, in opposing it, saying to his colleagues that they must not mistake the spirit of the age, by which, of course, he meant that the spirit was one of freedom for all—except Catholics. When Professor *Mack*, of the University of Tübingen, and several assistant professors of William's College were dismissed for teaching the Catholic doctrine on mixed marriages, this being the easiest and most convenient way of answering their arguments, the Bishop of Rottenburg († October 17, 1845) again entered his protest against so unwarrantable a proceeding, but was once more unsuccessful.

Again, when Catholic professors of name at the various Universities within the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine would not consent to keep silence, they were peremptorily dismissed. Thus *Riffel*, Professor of Theology at the University of *Giessen*, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, having commenced to discuss the origin of the Reformation, after he had got on a little way, was retired by the Government, this being a most efficient way of stopping a man's mouth whose arguments are disagreeably embarrassing.[1] In the Upper Chamber of Würtemberg, however, there seems to have been still some sense of justice left, for on the 6th of June, 1842, a motion was put and carried providing that an address should be sent to the king, praying him to have the relations of the Catholic Church and the civil power definitely and *equitably* settled.[2] Still the Government was tardy; justice came slowly; and it needed the stimulus of new events to hasten fresh concessions.

The condition of affairs in Baden was no better. Archbishop *Boll* died in 1836, and his successors, *Demeter* and *Vicari* (from 1842), renewed the complaints and protests of their predecessor, but to no purpose. To the hostility of the bureau of administration was now added the opposition of the Chambers, which, in a freak of eccentric liberalism, advocated the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy. This movement, however, was not altogether new. As far back as 1828 a number of lay professors of the University of Freiburg, more zealous than wise,[3] sent memorials to the States-General and the Grand Duke of Baden, asking the co-operation of both in abolishing celibacy among the Catholic clergy. Some time later, *Dominic Kuenzer*, rector of the church attached to the hospital at Constance, formed an association with this avowed object, but including in its scope many other ecclesiastical reforms of a kindred nature, and, when admonished by his superiors to dissolve it, was supported in his disobedience by the Department of Worship

---

marriages, had always regarded them with less favour than even the Protestant, her ministers should not be compelled to give the marriage blessing in assisting at them, because, inasmuch as they acted from religious motives, to employ compulsion would be to violate both the principles of religious freedom and the letter of the constitution. 6. That the Ecclesiastical Council should have no recognized inquisitorial rights over the clergy, and that its acts should receive no recognition, even when confirmed by superior authority, unless they had been first submitted to the proper officials of the diocese and obtained their approbation. 7. That, inasmuch as the Church had a right to manage her own affairs and govern herself, and had given the bishop complete control over his seminary, he alone should be the judge of the qualifications of candidates coming up for orders. 8. That the right claimed by the Government to censure works of Catholic theology should be given up, as it was regarded as shamefully oppressive, not alone by the Catholic clergy, but by all literary men; that since the Protestants had a free press, so also should the Catholics, and that this could not be denied them on the ground of either intellectual or moral abuse of the privilege, because, among Catholic publicists, to abuse the Press would be to commit commercial suicide. 9. That it should be the office of the bishop to pass upon the qualifications of one who was to preach the word of God by making him undergo at the episcopal residence a public examination, previously to conferring upon him the benefices of the Church.

[1] *The Catholic*, 1841, December, Suppl., p. XCII. sq.; 1842, January, Suppl., p. XXXVII. sq. *Sion*, 1842, April, p. 46 sq. "The Right of Investigation," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., pp. 158-168.

[2] See the "Circular of the Old Man of the Mountain (which occupied an important place in the debates of the Chambers, Peterfels, June, 1842), addressed to Minister *von Schlayer*," in *The Catholic*, 1842, June Suppl.

[3] Cfr. *Moehler*, The Memorial in behalf of the Abolition of Clerical Celibacy, with Three Documents reviewed. (Complete Works of the *same*, Vol. I., pp. 177-267.) †*Bader*, The Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Freiburg, 1860.

at Carlsruhe, and *encouraged to threaten them with the vengeance of the Chambers if they persisted* (1839).

The Grand Duke Leopold did all he could towards ameliorating the condition of the Church by acts of a personal nature, such as appointing men of sound Catholic principles to professorships in the Theological Faculty of the University of Freiburg, and building a theological seminary (1842); but his efforts were of little avail, as the Government contrived in some way to nullify them. Two bills, the one introduced by *Buss*, in 1846, and the other by *Hirscher* in 1850, for the repeal of laws limiting the liberty of the Church, were both defeated in the Chambers.

§ 410. *The Catholic Church in Russia.* (Cf. § 385.)

Persécution et souffrances de l'église catholique en Russie, etc., Paris, 1842; Germ. by *Zürcher*, Schaffh., 1843. *A. Theiner*, The Latest Condition of the Catholic Church of the Two Rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II., Augsburg, 1841. A Glance at Russian History (*Hist.* and *Polit Papers*, Vols. V., IX., X., and XI.) **Hefele*, The Russian Church (Essays on Ch. H., Vol. I. *A. v. Haxthausen*, Researches on the Interior Condition of Russia, Hanover, 1847, 2 pts. Le catholicisme romain en Russie, études historiques par le comte. *Dmitry-Tolstoi*, Paris, 2 vols. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. I., pp. 161-172; Vol. III., pp. 531-594. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism, Vol. II., p. 202 sq. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Church of Russia, 2 vols.

When the Empress *Catharine* (1762-1796) extended her protection to the Jesuits, after the suppression of the Society by Clement XIV., she acted partly from principle, but chiefly from policy; and although she permitted them to retain their colleges in White Russia, that is, those portions of Poland lying to the east of the Dvina and Dnieper that fell to the lot of Russia in the first partition of Poland, she was not on that account less intolerant of the Catholic Church, for she wrested from her the metropolitan see of Kiev, transferring it to the Schismatical Greeks, and suppressed the Basilian monasteries and the sees in possession of the United Greeks. By the second partition of Poland, in 1793, nearly all the sees of the United Greeks passed under the dominion of Russia, and while Catharine was under pledge (Art. VIII.) to protect the Catholics of both Rites, she was secretly devising means to bring the United Greeks over to the "Orthodox" Greek Church. She was in a large measure successful, for before her death she had already severed seven millions of them from obedience to the Church of Rome.[1]

Paul I. (1796-1801), her successor, was more just towards Catholics. Conjointly with *Litta*, the Apostolic Nuncio, he made arrangements for the reorganization of the Catholic Church in Russia. The measures agreed upon were confirmed by *Pius VI.*, in a bull dated November 15, 1798, by which *Mohilev* was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see, with jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Latin Rite in Russia. By the same bull, the United Greeks, against whom the persecutions now ceased, also obtained an ecclesiastical organization, with *Polotzk* as an archbishopric, and *Luzk* and *Brecsz* as suffragan sees.

Alexander I. (1801-1825) was also favourably disposed towards the Catholic Church, as is shown by the fact that he added four assessors from the Church of the United Greek Rite to the Roman

[1] *Jauffret*, Catharine II. et son règne, Paris, 2 vols.

Catholic ecclesiastical commission at St. Petersburg. As long as this equitable treatment lasted the number of Catholics of both Rites rapidly increased, notwithstanding the fact that the Russian Archbishops *Platon* and *Methodius* were endeavouring to rouse the passions of the people by their vehement assaults on the Pope; and that the young and gifted *Alexander de Sturdza*, who was most probably in the pay of Napoleon, was doing a similar work beyond the confines of the Russian Empire.[1]

When *Nicholas I.* (1825-1855) ascended the throne he at once returned to the persecuting policy of Catharine II., one of his first acts being to issue an *edict against the sale of devotional works for the United Greeks.*

By a ukase of April 22, 1828, the organization of the United Greeks was abolished, the administration of their Church being placed under the control of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs, and the Roman Catholic metropolitan see suppressed and replaced by an ecclesiastical commission appointed by the *Emperor*. The bishopric of Luzk and many of the Basilian monasteries were also suppressed. A number of these monasteries were permitted to exist as parishes until the year 1832 (January 19), when they also shared the fate of the others, the whole Order being abolished by the emperor. By *five other ukases*, most skilfully and craftily drawn up, the United Greek Church was shorn of every vestige of freedom. The whole enormity of the plot was not revealed, however, until the culmination of that stupendous act of treason, planned by three bishops, of whom *Joseph Siemazko* was the leader, and participated in by thirteen hundred and five ecclesiastics, who, on the 12th of February, 1839, declared, in a document previously drawn up at Polotzk, that they withdrew from obedience of the Church of Rome, and with simulated sincerity begged the emperor and the Holy Synod to receive them into the fold of the Schismatical Greek Church. Another measure, equally perfidious, was the spreading of a report among the Protestants of the Baltic provinces that such as would apostatize to the Orthodox Establishment should receive the estates of the German landlords.[2] Gregory XVI. loudly protested against the persecution of the Catholics; but neither his protests, nor his conference with the Emperor Nicholas in Rome,[3] nor the negotiations conducted by his successor have had any material influence in mitigating the persecution inflicted upon Latin and United Greek Catholics by Russia.[4] But, while

[1] Cf. *Pichler*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 310 sq. At page 313 of this work some one is quoted anonymously as saying: "In the Russian Church there is but one dogma, viz., hatred of the Pope of Rome; for the others no one cares a straw."

[2] Cf. The Roman State Papers on the subject, beginning with the year 1842, in which ninety documents are given.

[3] See § 398, vers. fin.

[4] A concordat was concluded August 3, 1847, in virtue of which the Latin Church in Russia was reorganized in two provinces. The first, the ecclesiastical province of *Mohilev*, including all the Latin Catholics of the empire, except those of Poland, comprised the metropolitan, with the six suffragan sees of *Kamieniec, Luzk-Zytomir, Minsk, Samogitia*

persecuting at home, the Russian Government affected to be the friend of *religious liberty* abroad, and, in 1855 and 1877, provoked a most calamitous war, on the ostensible pretext of securing it to the *Greeks resident in Turkey*.

Nicholas died, March 2, 1855, and, owing to the disastrous issue of the war, in which France, England, and Sardinia sided with Turkey, his successor, *Alexander II.*, saw the necessity of making many concessions, both political and commercial, to the people of his empire; but the idea of granting freedom of worship to the Roman Catholics has not yet impressed the Tzar as a necessary or even equitable measure.

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

§ 411. *His Political Activity.*

Pie IX. Pontif. max. acta, Roma, 3 T. †*Riancey*, Recueil des actes de N. P. S. P. le pape Pie IX. comprenant le texte et traduction des tous les documents officiels, Paris, 1853 sq. †*Margotti*, The Victories of the Church during the First Decade of the Pontificate of Pius IX., transl. fr. the Italian into German by *Pius Gams*, O. S. B., Innsbruck, 1857. *Pius IX. as Pope and King, according to the Acts of his Pontificate, Vienna, 1865. *Louis Veuillot*, Pius IX. a Mirror of Catholic Character (in Germ.), Vienna, 1864. *Hülskamp*, Pope Pius IX., his Life and Works, Münster, 1870. A Life of Pius IX. down to the Episcopal Jubilee of 1877, by Rev. *B. O'Reilly*, New York, 1877.

On the 1st of June, 1846, Gregory XVI. died, while still in the midst of his untiring labours for the good of the Church. As the conclave by which he was elected had been one of the longest, so that which elected his successor was the shortest held for three hundred years, the opening taking place on the 14th, and the closing on the 16th of June. Of the two parties into which the cardinals composing the conclave were divided, that of the *moderate liberals* was the more numerous; and when it became evident that Cardinal Lambruschini, the conservative candidate, had no chance of being chosen, they united their votes on Cardinal *Mastaï-Ferretti*.

Giovanni Maria Mastaï-Ferretti was born at Sinigaglia, in the States of the Church, May 13, 1792. He was originally enrolled by the French as one of the Italian guard, but being subsequently exempted he entered the priesthood. Having laboured for some time in Rome, he was sent by Leo XII., in 1823, as "auditor" of the Apostolic Delegate to Chili. He was appointed Archbishop of Spoleto in 1827, and transferred to the see of Imola in 1832. Notwithstanding his well-known liberal political views, he was appointed by Gregory XVI. cardinal, Dec. 14, 1840, in recognition of the eminent services he had rendered to the Church, and when called to the

(residence *Telcze*) *Wilna*, and *Cherson* (residence *Tiraspol*); the second, the province of *Warsaw*, comprised all Russian Poland, the metropolitan, with the six suffragan sees of *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Podlachia* or *Jarrow*, *Sandomir*, *Seyna* or *Augustova*, *Vladimir-Kalish* or *Cujavia*. The exempt see of *Chelm-Belz* is the last remnant of the once flourishing Ruthenian or United Greek Church of Poland. See *Jacob Neher's* Eccl. Geogr., Vol. II., pp. 433-456. (Tr.)

Papacy was one of the youngest members in the College. As Pope, he took the name of *Pius IX.*, and his accession was hailed with universal and sincere joy by the Roman people. The words uttered by him on the day of his coronation, June 21, *Oggi comincia la persecuzione* (To-day persecution begins), were prophetic. His pontificate, which is the longest in the history of the papacy, having now lasted close upon thirty-two years, has been filled with events the most momentous and various, and marked by sufferings and persecutions of every kind. During it an unceasing struggle has been kept up against both the principles and the workings of the Revolutionists.

It may be conveniently divided into *three parts:*

I. The *first*, extending from June 16, 1846, to April 12, 1850, includes the amnesty and the political reforms in the States of the Church, the Revolution of 1848, the flight of the Pope to Gaëta, and his return to Rome.

II. The *second*, extending from 1850 to 1859, includes what this Pope has done to forward the interests and increase the glory of the Church in the various countries of the world.

III. The *third*, beginning with the invasion and plunder of the States of the Church by Sardinia (1859), and coming down to the present day, includes the trials and persecutions endured by the papacy, which, though severe and numerous, were instrumental in working out a process of purification among Catholics generally.

Men of earnestness and sincerity, the world over, have given comfort to the Head of the Church and glory to the Catholic name by their uncompromising loyalty and unbounded devotion to the principles of their faith. As to the rest, their open defection now from the Catholic Church only shows that they had long since interiorly apostatized. They go out from us because they are not of us, and naturally they swell the ranks of the persecutors of the Church.

Inasmuch as Gregory XVI. had not at the time of his death carried out in his States the social and political reforms recommended to him by the Great Powers in their *Memorandum* of 1831,[1] Pius IX. felt that, to avert from the Holy See the dangers that menaced it, there was a call upon him to give his immediate attention to these hitherto neglected branches of the pontifical government. His natural tenderness of heart, as well as the pacific character of his office of Sovereign Pontiff, prompted him to begin with an act of *amnesty*, more extensive than had been granted for many years, and designed as a measure of conciliation. Thousands who had languished in prison were restored to their families and to the pursuits of active life.

The concessions made by Pius IX. at this time were so extensive, and followed each other in such rapid succession, that many began to take alarm, fearing that the Pontiff was acting from the impulses

[1] Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, in several articles of Vols. 43 and 44, and *Augsburg Univ. Gazette*, 1849, in the Supplements to Nos. 236 and 237.

of his own generous nature, rather than from the dictates of political prudence. These concessions contained in themselves the elements of a political constitution, which, it was ardently hoped, would soon take definite shape, and be made the basis of a popular government. Commissions were appointed to reform the system of administration, and to revise the laws; a new Council of State, consisting of younger prelates, was named; and Cardinal *Gizzi*, who was universally regarded as belonging to the liberal school of politics, was made Secretary of State. A large number of *laymen* were called to take office in the Civil Service; the Press was made more free; and charters for constructing *railways* were granted. These reforms created a feeling of uneasiness in the minds of a few far-seeing men, but by the great bulk of the Italian people they were hailed with acclamations of joy. The cry, "*Evviva Pio Nono*" ("Long live Pius IX."), went up from one end of Italy to the other, and even Protestant Europe gave expression to its sentiments of approval in a *Hymn to Pius the Ninth*.

It soon became evident, however, that these ample concessions, so generously made, neither satisfied the demands nor conciliated the affections of a large number of restless and revolutionary spirits. The *Reduci*, or Radicals, returning from prison and exile, at once set busily to work to overthrow every support of order in both Church and State. And when, in 1848, inspired by the events that had taken place in France, the inhabitants of nearly every city of Italy, from Lombardy to Sicily, rose in rebellion, the Radicals of Rome concluded that their time for action had also come. Demonstrations were held and every means employed in any way calculated to excite and influence the passions of the people. The Pope was pressed to make still larger concessions, as, for example, to expel the Jesuits from Rome. Under pretence of doing him honour, it was attempted to make him an instrument in the hands of the Mazzinists, to force him to declare war against Austria, and to place him at the head of a "crusade" of all Italy, the object of which was to free the country from foreign domination. A new Constitution had been granted March 14, 1848; a reform ministry had been appointed; and two Chambers had been established; the one to regulate the taxes, and the other to pass laws; but the malcontents were by no means satisfied. They still continued to incite the people to rebellion, and, because the Pope declined to make war on Austria, sought to strip him of every vestige of authority, forcing upon him the revolutionary ministry of *Mamiani*.

In vain did Pius IX. recommend (March 31) moderation to the Italians; in vain did he remind them, in an allocution dated April 29, "that, as the Father of all Christendom, he could take no part in the quarrels of political factions, and that his only wish was to secure peace to the entire world, but, above all, to Italy." The demagogues, who had but recently spoken of him in terms of enthusiastic admiration, now used towards him only expressions of reproach and hatred.

The Pope was now obliged to dismiss the Mamiani ministry, and after appointing several others, each of which proved unequal to the task of administering public affairs, he placed at the head of the Government *Count Rossi*, a man of energy and determination, who resolved to take such measures as would effectually restore peace and re-establish public order. He was not spared to carry out his intentions. While ascending the stairway leading to the Apostolic Chancery, on the 15th of November, 1848, to open the Chamber of Deputies, he was assassinated, thus falling a victim to the fury of the revolutionary party.[1] Tumultuous and menacing deputations now presented themselves to the Holy Father, peremptorily demanding the appointment of a democratic ministry, the recognition of Italian nationality, and the continuation of the war against Austria.

Borne down with sorrow, and completely undeceived as to the criminal intentions of the malcontents, Pius IX. resolved to quit the city, and with the aid of Count Spaur, the Bavarian ambassador, succeeded in making good his escape to Gaëta, November 24, 1848. Anticipating the issue of events, the bulk of the cardinals had previously left Rome, where a reign of terror had already set in. Rome was forthwith proclaimed a Republic by the Mazzinists and Garibaldians; its inhabitants were intimidated into acquiescence by the hordes of anarchists who flocked thither from all countries; ecclesiastical and private property was seized; and religion and its ministers were made the objects of derision and scorn. On the 9th of February 1849, the Pope was deposed from his temporal sovereignty by the newly-convoked Constituent Assembly, and on the 18th of the same month a law was passed by that body declaring all ecclesiastical property secularized, and confiscating it to the State. Instead of the reign of order, which had been promised, anarchy everywhere prevailed.

The victory gained by *Radetzky* over the Piedmontese, near Novara, on the 23rd of March, deprived the Roman Republic of all hope of stability. In response to a call issued by the Pope at Gaëta, requesting the intervention of the Catholic powers, France, although at that time under a republican form of government, sent a considerable army into Italy, under the command of Oudinot, which retook Rome, July 3rd, and expelled the Revolutionists, commanded by Garibaldi; while in the North the Austrians had occupied the Legations.

The Government of the city and that portion of the Papal States now in possession of the French was placed in the hands of Cardinals della Genga, Vannicelli, and Altieri. The Pope, in a note dated Gaëta, September 12, promised both financial and administrative reforms, and on the 18th of the same month published a decree of amnesty. He returned to Rome, April 12, 1850. The Diplomatic Corps presented him with an address, in which they said: "The

[1] *Hurter*, History of the Assasination of Count Peregrin Rossi, Innsbruck, 1855.

return of Your Holiness to your States is hailed by all Governments as a favourable augury, and is regarded as an event of unusual importance for the restoration of law and order, which are so essential to the well-being of nations and the maintenance of peace."

Although sincerely grieved at the disappointment of his most cherished hopes, and deeply affected by the ingratitude of his subjects, the Pope, on his return to Rome, manifested a spirit of clemency and love, rather than of anger and resentment. After a short time, the old order of things was restored, both in Rome and throughout the whole of the Papal States, and peace and tranquillity once more reigned. In September a complete ministry was formed, at the head of which the prudent and skilful Cardinal *Antonelli* was placed, under the old title of Secretary of State. The work of Public Instruction was again committed to the Jesuits, who were now returning. Notwithstanding that many reforms had been introduced into the Civil Service and the departments of agriculture and commerce, during the occupation of Rome by the French and of Bologna and Ancona by the Austrians, still the offensive and stereotyped accusation that *priests*, wherever they had any hand in the administration of the government, proved themselves both *arrogant* and *incapable*, was constantly reiterated. The testimony of *Count Rayneval*, the French ambassador, who, in a detailed report, based upon public and authentic documents, and written in a calm spirit of judicial fairness, showed conclusively that the "*Papal Government gave its subjects no cause to fear any abridgment of their rights*,"[1] produced little or no effect, and was powerless to correct the misrepresentations set afloat about the clergy. From the day that *Count Cavour*, the Piedmontese Minister, became the leader of the Revolutionists, the agitation grew daily more alarming. Fresh causes of provocation were given to Austria; a subscription was opened to collect money for the purchase of one hundred cannon, to be placed upon the fortifications of Alessandria, whence they were to belch forth their thunders against the Barbarians; and the residences of the Piedmontese diplomatists, consuls, and agents became everywhere the rendezvous for the disaffected. In the year 1856, Count Cavour and Louis Napoleon drew up a project with regard to the future of Italy, which, however, was to be kept secret until the year 1859, when it was to be carried into execution. On New Year's day of the latter year, Napoleon, in replying to the congratulations of the Diplomatic Body, took occasion to show his hostile designs against Austria and his views with regard to Italy.

War broke out between Austria and Sardinia, the latter supported by the military power of France. After the disastrous issues of the battles of Magenta and Solferino, Austria withdrew her troops from Bologna, Ancona, and the Romagna, which were at once taken possession of by the hostile army, and the papal authorities expelled.

[1] The memorial in Mr. *Maguire's* Rome, Its Ruler and Its Institutions, New York, 1858. *Hergenroether*, The States of the Church since the French Revolution, Freiburg, 1860.

On the 18th of March, 1860, the Legations, together with Parma and Modena, were formally annexed to Sardinia; and Tuscany, Naples, and Sicily were later on similarly incorporated. By the Treaty of Zurich, Lombardy was ceded to the newly-created Kingdom of Italy, which, however, was in turn forced to surrender Savoy and Nizza to indemnify France for her services.

Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, now desired to get possession of Umbria and the Marches belonging to the States of the Church; and the Emperor of the French allowed this usurpation to take place in the very presence of an army which he had sent to Italy for the avowed purpose of protecting the Pope and defending his rights. The insignificant Pontifical army, under the command of the gallant generals *Lamoricière* and *Pimodan*, was also treacherously assaulted by a well-disciplined force six times its number, and well nigh annihilated, near Castel-Fidardo, Sept. 18, 1860. The Pope was now despoiled of four-fifths of his States, Rome alone and the surrounding territory, with a population of about 700,000 souls, being all that was left to him. Apart from the debt of $11,000,000, which the two invasions had cost the Papal Government, it was also burdened with the usual expenses of the administration, with no means of paying either, except the scanty resources derived from the remnant of territory that still remained of the Patrimony of Peter. These financial embarrassments gave occasion to an unusual and touching manifestation of loyalty to the Head of the Church by the Catholics of the Christian world, who eagerly took up the Papal Loan, or, if they were not wealthy enough to aid him in this way, contributed generously to the *Peter Pence* fund,[1] thus providing resources sufficient to enable him to meet all his engagements.

The Revolutionists still continued to threaten the invasion of what remained of the Papal States, demanding that Rome should be made the capital of Italy, and ceaselessly repeating the watchword, "*Rome or death.*"

While these events were going forward, the Emperor Napoleon and King Victor Emmanuel signed a treaty at Paris, September 15, 1864, in which it was stipulated that the Italian capital should be transferred from Turin to Florence in the following year; that the King of Italy should see to it that no further attacks were made on what remained of the States of the Church; and that, with the exception of the garrisons in a few frontier towns, the French army should be withdrawn from the Papal States within two years. This last stipulation was not fully carried out until December 15, 1866. From the year 1867 until 1870, the only defenders of the Patrimony of St. Peter were the soldiers of the newly organized Papal army, consisting of about ten thousand men. In the meantime, owing to victories gained by Germans over Germans, on the battle-fields of Bohemia, in June and July, 1866, Austria was forced to surrender

[1] Cf. The Peter Pence of Nineteenth Century (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. 45 and 46).

her claims to Venice, which was forthwith annexed to the Kingdom of Italy. The Garibaldian campaign against Rome, opened in October, 1867, had a most disastrous issue, the invaders being completely defeated at Mentana, November 3.

Notwithstanding that the Italian kingdom had received so many and so considerable accessions to its territory, and was to all appearances united, it was, nevertheless, both financially and politically, in a most deplorable condition. In spite of the enormous sums realized from the sale of confiscated Church property, the Government was threatened with bankruptcy; disorder reigned in every branch of the administration; and officials were corrupt, dishonest, and incapable. Moreover, civil marriage, which was made obligatory by a law of January 1, 1865, was by no means calculated to check the course of existing evils, or to purify the rapidly decaying morals.

In allocutions, published September 26, 1859; June 13 and December 17, 1860, and September 30, 1861, Pius IX. remonstrated "that virgins consecrated to God should be obliged to beg their bread; that God's temples should be plundered and changed into dens of thieves, and the property of the Church confiscated; and that ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction should be disregarded and usurped, and the laws of the Church contemned and trampled under foot." But neither his complaints nor his menaces produced the least effect. Things went on as before. True, Victor Emmanuel did send *Vegezzi* to Rome in 1864, and *Tonello* in 1867, to open negotiations with the Holy See, but their mission was productive of no results, if we except the provisions for diminishing the number of bishoprics, and down to the present hour no definite understanding has been arrived at between the Pope and the Italian Government. While there were formerly eighty-two bishoprics in the States of the Church and twenty-four archiepiscopal and seventy-eight episcopal sees in Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples, there were to be now only about eighty in the whole of Italy. Moreover, convents of men were to be abolished, and the number of the clergy largely reduced. But if the persecution endured by the Italian clergy was hard and relentless, it was not wholly unproductive of good. It purified their lives, strengthened their faith, and rekindled their zeal. Repeating the words of the Holy Father, who was their pattern in virtue and their guide in politics, each of them said: "*I may become the victim of the revolution, but I shall never be its accomplice.*" A few, but only a few, of the clergy, among the best known of whom were Cardinal d'Andrea, Bishop Caputo, and Father Passaglia, went over to the camp of the enemies of the Church. The *Armonia* and the *Unità Cattolica*, both published at Turin, and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, formerly published at Rome, but since 1871 at Florence, then as now courageously and persistently defended the rights of the Church, and never ceased to warn the faithful against the designs of men who treacherously promise "*a Free Church in a Free State.*"

§ 412. *Energy displayed by Pius IX. in Ecclesiastical Affairs.*

The political conflicts and persecutions that have disturbed the long pontificate of Pius IX. have not prevented him from displaying a most marvellous energy in ecclesiastical affairs throughout the whole of the Christian world.

On the 9th of November, 1846, he addressed an encyclical letter to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic world, in which he clearly pointed out the most dangerous errors of the times, adding that, as it was the special office of the *Church* to correct these, so was she *alone* competent and able to do so, provided only her pastors were vigilant and earnest. Up to the year 1877 he had raised twenty-four bishoprics to the dignity of archiepiscopal sees; had established five new archbishoprics, one hundred and thirty bishoprics, and three privileged abbacies (*nullius diœceseos*); and had created three apostolic delegations, thirty-three apostolic vicariates, and fifteen apostolic prefectures.[1] It is said that he contemplates establishing several new sees in America. He has also given special attention to the *Churches of the Oriental Rite*, establishing (Jan. 6, 1862), an Eastern branch of the Propaganda, consisting of nine cardinals, one for each of the various nations, fifteen consultors, and a cardinal prefect. The first to hold the office of Cardinal prefect for the Eastern branch of the Propaganda was the Cardinal *Reisach*.[2]

By a bull, dated Sept. 24, 1850, he re-established the *episcopacy in England*, thus restoring the *Catholic hierarchy* to that country, and abolishing the apostolic vicariates which had hitherto existed there. By a second bull, dated November 19 of the same year, he authorized the twelve bishops and the Archbishop of Westminster, constituting the English hierarchy, to establish canonries in their respective cathedral churches.

Similar provisions were made for *Holland* on the 7th of March, 1853. By a bull of July 23, 1847, he re-established the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, appointing Mgr. Valerga to that dignity, with, however, only the jurisdiction of an archbishop. Pius IX. had hoped that the *concordats* entered into with Russia, in 1847; with Tuscany and Spain, in 1851; with Costarica and Guatemala, in 1852; with Austria, in 1855; with Würtemberg, in 1857; with Baden, in 1859; and with Nicaragua and San Salvador, in 1861, would be productive of much good; but in this case he was in nearly every instance disappointed, either because the concordats were not faithfully executed, or because they were not adequate to meet the wants they were intended to supply.[3]

This Pope has raised quite a number of extra-Italian metropolitans and other distinguished churchmen of the Catholic world to the rank of the cardinalate. The recipients

[1] There is a rumour that the hierarchy will be restored to Scotland in 1878. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 5-12; and *La Gerarchia Cattolica* for 1877, p. XV. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 169-186.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 53-84.

of this honour in FRANCE were: *Giraud*, Abp. of Cambrai (appointed 1847, died 1850); *Dupont*, Abp. of Bourges (1847-59); *D'Astros*, Abp. of Toulouse (1850-51); *Gousset*, Abp. of Rheims (1850-56); *Matthieu*, Abp. of Besançon (1850-75); *Donnet*, Abp. of Bordeaux (1852); *Villecourt*, Bp. of La Rochelle (1853-67); *Morlot*, Abp. of Paris (1853-62); *Billiet*, Abp. of Chambéry (1861-73); *Bonnechose*, Abp. of Rouen (1862); Dom *Pitra*, O.S.B., of Solesme (1863); Lucien *Bonaparte*, a native of Rome (1868); *Régnier*, Abp. of Rennes (1875); *Caverot*, Abp. of Lyons (1877); and Frederic *de Falloux du Coudray* (1877). In BELGIUM: *Deschamps*, C.SS.R., Abp. of Malines (1875). In GERMANY and the AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN MONARCHY: John *de Geissel*, Abp. of Cologne (1850-64); *Sommerau-Beckh*, Abp. of Olmütz (1850-53); John *de Scitowski*, Abp. of Gran (1853-66); Othmar *von Rauscher*, Abp. of Vienna (1855-75); Charles *von Reisach*, Abp. of Munich (1855-69); *Lewicki*, Ruthenian Abp. of Lemberg (1856-58); *Haulik*, Abp. of Agram (1856-69); Gustavus Adolphus, *Prince de Hohenlohe*, the Papal Almoner, a native of Germany (1866); *Tarnoczy*, Abp. of Salzburg (1873-76); *Simor*, Abp. of Gran (1873); *Ledochowski*, Abp. of Gnesen and Posen (1875); J. B. *Franzelin*, S.J., Professor at the Roman College, a native of Germany (1876); *Kutschker*, Abp. of Vienna (1877); and *Mihalovitz*, Abp. of Agram (1877). In SPAIN and PORTUGAL: *Bonnel y Orbe*, Abp. of Toledo (1850-57); Peter Paul *de Figueredo de Cunha e Mello*, Abp. of Braga (1850-56); Cyril *de Alameda y Brea*, Abp. of Toledo (1858-62); *Tarancon*, Abp. of Seville (1858-62); *Rodriguez*, Patriarch of Lisbon (1858-69); *De la Puente*, Abp. of Burgos (1861-67); Michael *Garcia Cuesta*, Abp. of Compostella (1861-73); Luis *de la Lastra Cuesta*, Abp. of Seville (1863-76); John Ignatius *de Moreno*, a native of Guatemala, Abp. of Toledo (1868); Mariano *Barrio y Fernandez* (1873-76); *Cardoso*, Patr. of Lisbon (1873); F. P. *Benavides y Navarrete* (1877); Manuel *Garcia Gil* (1877); Michael *Paga y Rico*, Abp. of Compostella (1877). In ENGLAND: Nicholas *Wiseman* (1850-65); Henry Edward *Manning* (1875), Archbishops of Westminster; and Mgr. *Howard* (1877). In IRELAND: Paul *Cullen*, Abp. of Dublin and Primate of Ireland (1866). And in the UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA: John *M'Closkey*, Abp. of New York (1875).[1]

When Pius IX. learned the character of the persecutions endured by the Catholics of Sardinia, New Granada, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, Poland, and other countries, he at once published *allocutions* expressing sympathy with the oppressed, and warning their oppressors of the criminal wrong they were doing. He also put an end to the senseless controversy between M. *Gaume* and the *Univers* newspaper, relative to the propriety of teaching the *Pagan Classics* in the education of youth, by declaring in favour of their use.[2] He censured the erroneous teachings of Günther, of Vienna; Frohschammer, of Munich; and Ubaghs, of Louvain; and, by numerous documents, condemned the leading *errors of the present times* concerning science, politics, and social life. But that these errors might be stated more distinctly, and brought home with greater force to men's minds, he commissioned *Cardinal Bilio* to extract them from the numerous documents in which they were separately contained, and to arrange them in a series of propositions. These were eighty in number, classified under ten heads. Such is the history of the

[1] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, pp. 69-139, and *Civiltà Cattolica* of 1877; also *Catholic Almanac* pp. 56, 57, New York, 1878. (TR.)

[2] See Epistola encyclica ad Galliarum episcopos, d. d., 21 Martii, 1853. And when, later on, the Sulpicians of Quebec renewed the quarrel, the S. Congregation of the Inquisition, referring to this decision, deprecated, by letter of February 15, 1867, such fastidiousness, saying: "Explorata enim res et antiqua constantique consuetudine comprobata adolescentes etiam clericos germanam dicendi scribendique elegantiam et eloquentiam sive ex sapientissimis SS. Patrum operibus, sive ex clarissimis ethnicis scriptoribus ab omni labe purgatis absque ullo periculo addiscere optimo jure posse." See *Analecta juris Pontificii*, IXe série, col. 767. (TR.)

famous "*Syllabus of Errors*," which, together with the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*, was sent to all the Catholic bishops of the world, December 8, 1864.[1] The titles of the various heads of the Syllabus are as follows:—

I. Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism.

II. Modified Rationalism.

III. Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism.

IV. Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-liberal Societies.

V. Errors concerning the Church and Her Rights.

VI. Errors concerning Civil Society, considered both in itself and in its Relations to the Church.

VII. Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics.

VIII. Errors concerning Christian Marriage.

IX. Errors concerning the civil power of the Roman Pontiff.

X. Errors concerning Modern Liberalism.

Liturgical questions also claimed a share of the solicitude of Pius IX.

On the 9th of November, 1846, he made provision for the maintenance of the various Oriental liturgies; on the 31st of May, 1850, he raised the Feast of the Visitation of the B. V. M. to a double of the second class; on the 18th of May, 1854, he ordered that the feasts of SS. Timothy, Titus, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, should be celebrated throughout the Church in the lesser double rite; he declared St. Hilary of Poitiers (*Pictavium*) in 1851, St. Alfonso Maria da Liguori in 1871, and St. Francis de Sales in 1877, *Doctors* of the Church; and, finally, in December 8, 1870, he proclaimed St. Joseph, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Patron of the Universal Church, and raised his feast to the rank of the first class. No former Pope *beatified* or placed on the catalogue of *Saints* so large a number as Pius IX.[2] On the

[1] Sanct. D. N. Pii IX. epist. encyclica die VIII., Dec., 1864, una cum Syllabo præcipuorum ætatis nostræ errorum et actis Pontificis, ex quibus excerptus est syllabus, Ratisbonæ, 1865. Out of the numerous *Commentaries* on it, we but mention Bp. *Dupanloup*, the Convention of Sept. 15, and the Encyclica of Dec. 8. (In Germ., by *Molzberger*, Würzbg., 1865); (by an Anonymous), Cologne, at Bachem's, 1865; the Pope and Modern Ideas, Vienna, at Sartori's, 1864; Voices of Maria-Laach, edited by the Jesuit Fathers, Flor., *Riefs*, *Roh*, *Rattinger*, and *Schneemann*, Freiburg (Herder), 1865-67, eight numbers. (Explanation and Defence of the Syllabus.)

[2] The following were beatified: *Peter Claver, S.J.;* Venerable *Maria Anna de Paredes; John de Britto, S.J.; John Grande*, of the Order of the Brothers of Charity; *Paul of the Cross*, Founder of the new Congregation of the Passion of Our Lord J. Xt.; Venerable *Germaine Cousin; Andrew Bobola, S.J.;* the martyred parish-priest, *John Sarkander, Canon de' Rossi; Benedict Joseph Labre; John Leonardi*, Founder of the Congr. of Clerics of the Mother of God; *Peter Canisius, S.J.; Margaret Mary Alacoque*, of the Visitation Order; *Mary of the Angels; John Berchmanns, S.J.; Benedict of Urbino; Clement Maria Hofbauer*, C. SS. R., &c., with whom there were, on the Feast of Pentecost of 1867, still associated two hundred and five martyrs of Japan. There were canonized, on the Feast of Pentecost, 9th of June, 1862, in the presence of nearly three hundred bishops, *twenty-six Japanese Martyrs* (twenty-three Franciscans, three Jesuits), and the confessor *Michaël de Santis*, of the Order of Trinitarians. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 20-43. The last canonizations, on the 29th of June, 1867, the eighteenth

10th of December, 1863, he published a decree relative to the veneration of *relics*. This decree, which was called forth by the doubts raised as to whether the *palm-branches* and *blood-stained vessels* found in the Catacombs were to be accepted as certain proofs of martyrdom, did not place the question entirely beyond discussion. It merely declared "that to avoid giving scandal to the faithful, the blood-stained phials are, in the future as in the past, to be respected as tokens of martyrdom, and that the papal decree of 1668, relative to the question, is to be regarded as authoritative." He earnestly besought (May 3, 1848) all priests to celebrate the Holy Eucharist worthily: and in the encyclical *Optime scitis*, dated November 5, 1855, exhorted the bishops of Austria to carefully observe the rubrics of the Pontifical in performing their episcopal functions. By the bull *Quod jam pridem*, of September 25, 1863, he prescribed a new office and Mass for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Pius IX. has summoned the bishops of the world to Rome on *four* different occasions since the opening of his pontificate. On the first occasion, December 8, 1854, above two hundred were present; on the second, June 9, 1862, three hundred; on the third, June 29, 1867, five hundred; and on the last, December 8, 1869, above seven hundred assembled to take part in the proceedings of the Vatican Council. The occasion of the first assemblage was the promulgation as an article of faith of the dogma of the *Immaculate Conception* of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God. As early as the 2nd of February, 1849, the Pope had sent the encyclical *Ubi primum* to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, requesting them to express their wishes and opinions on the subject, and to beg the prayers of the faithful for the same object. A *Jubilee* was opened on the 1st of August, 1854, and on the 8th of December following this dogma was solemnly defined during Pontifical High Mass, in the presence of the Sacred College and the assembled bishops, and promulgated by the bull *Ineffabilis Deus*.[1] The proclamation of this dogma was hailed by Catholics

centenary celebration of the martyrdom of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, in the presence of five hundred bishops, were those of the Holy Martyr *Josaphat*, Archbishop of Polotzk; of the Holy Martyr *Peter de Arbuez*, Inquisitor of Aragon (against the numerous defamations of Arbuez, cfr. *Hist.* and *Polit Papers*, Vol. LX., p. 854, year 1873); of the *nineteen martyrs of Gorcum*, in Holland; of St. *Paul of the Cross;* of St. *Leonard a Porto-Mauritio;* of St. *Mary Frances*, of the Order of St. Peter of Alcantara and St. *Germaine* Cousin. Cf. *Hausherr, S.J.*, The Grand Celebration at St. Peter's, in Rome, on the 29th of June, 1867, Mentz, 1867, pp. 48-108. The Latin biography of the Interpreter *Estius* giving an account of the martyrs of Gorcum, transl. into German, Warendorf, 1867; *Laforêt*, Rector of the University of Louvain, The Martyrs of Gorcum (in French), Germ. transl., Münster, 1867.

[1] The definition, which is strictly in accord with the bull of Pope *Alexander VII.* (see p. 431, note 1), runs thus: Declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, *doctrinam, quæ tenet. Beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suæ Conceptionis fuisse singulari Omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpæ labe præservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam.* (Pii IX. P. M. acta T. I., p. 616.) Cf. De immaculato B. V. M. conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit, ed.

everywhere with unwonted expressions of joy, which was witnessed by the numerous statues, columns, and churches erected in every country to the honour of Mary Immaculate.

The bishops were a *second* time called together at Pentecost, 1862, to assist at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs,[1] and to take measures against the violent spoliation of the States of the Church. Previously to this time, numerous addresses, followed by thousands of signatures, had been sent from all parts of the world to the Holy Father, demanding the restoration of the States of the Church in their entirety, and protesting in the most emphatic terms against any future attempts upon them.[2] The bishops assembled at Rome also presented an address, thanking the Pope, in the name of all Catholics, for the determined stand he had made against lawless violence, and expressing their conviction that the Civil Power was *necessary* to the Holy See, to which it had been annexed by a special and visible providence of God. And they did not hesitate to repeat the words used by the Pope on the previous 25th of March, declaring that in the *actual* order of things the Civil Power was an *indispensable* requisite to the *free* government of the Church; that the Head of the Church of God could not be the subject of any prince; that he must enjoy the fullest independence in his own territory and in his own States; and that in no other way could he protect and defend the Catholic faith and guide and govern the whole Christian commonwealth. In remembrance of that eventful assemblage, the Holy Father presented each bishop with a copy of that grand memorial of Catholic unity, "*La sovranità temporale dei Romani Pontefici, propugnata nella sua integrità dal suffragio dell' orbe Cattolico regnante Pio IX.*" (Roma, 1860 sq.), containing the unanimous protests against the spoliation of the Patrimony of St. Peter, sent to Rome from the various countries of the world—from Italy and France; from Belgium and Switzerland; from Austria, Germany, and Holland; from Spain and Portugal and their dependencies; from England and Scotland; from Ireland and North America; from Turkey and Poland; and from India, China, and Oceanica.[3]

The bishops gathered around the throne of Pius IX. for the *third* time, on the 29th of June, 1867, to celebrate the *eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul,* and to assist at the canonization of a large number of *martyrs.*

Perrone, S.J., Rom., 1853; ed. *Passaglia*, S.J., Rom., 1854. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 12-20.

[1] See Vol. 3, pp. 468, 469.

[2] Cfr. *Schroedl*, The Verdict of Catholicism and its Confirmation by the whole Catholic World 'on the Importance and Necessity of the Civil Power and Sovereignty of the Holy See, Freiburg, 1867. In Pt. II., pp. 117-174, History of the Formation of the States of the Church. *Wiseman*, Rome and the Catholic Episcopate at the Feast of Pentecost, 1862 (transl. into Germ. by *Reusch*, Cologne, 1862). *A. Niedermayer* The Feast of Pentecost in Rome in 1862.

[3] The work consists of six vols., fol.

In giving expression to the feelings of joy that filled his heart at seeing gathered about him so many bishops, who, in obedience to his summons, had hastened to Rome with joyous alacrity from the farthest corners of the earth, Pius IX. spoke substantially as follows: Nothing, said he, could be more imposing than this assemblage, in which are gathered together representatives from every country of the Catholic world, to celebrate the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles; nothing could be more admirable than this illustration of the unity of the Catholic Church on the occasion of the canonization of martyrs, who shed their blood in defence of the Holy See and of the Catholic faith. Beholding this exemplification of the unity of the Catholic Church, her enemies will begin to appreciate her vast energies, and be forced to confess that in proclaiming her decrepit and effete they had been deluded. There can be no question but that if the bishops remain cordially united with the Head of the Church, her influence and power will go on increasing from day to day. I ardently hope that at some future day I may be again able to gather you all about me to take part in an *Œcumenical Council.*

The Holy Father also delivered an address in the Hall of Consistory to the *priests,* some ten thousand in number, who had come to Rome to witness and assist at the solemnities of the centenary. His manner was earnest and impressive, and his language simple and touching. He warned them never to lose sight of the fact that they were clothed with the dignity of the priesthood; to offer worthily every day the Most Holy Sacrifice, both for their own salvation and for that of all mankind; to be always conspicuous for austerity of manners, for purity and chastity of life, but, above all, for knowledge of the sacred sciences, that they might thus be able to battle valiantly against the enemies of the human race, to advance the glory of God, to secure the salvation of souls, and to prove themselves obedient subjects of their bishops and worthy soldiers of Jesus Christ. He finally gave them his blessing, commissioning them to give it in turn to their flocks in his name.

A deputation, consisting of fifteen hundred persons, and *representing one hundred cities of Italy,* presented the Pope with a splendid album, in which were inscribed the names of the hundred cities, followed by the signatures of their inhabitants still loyal to the Holy See. The presentation was made by Count Clodio Boschetti, of Modena, who, in his address, assured the Pope that the Italian people were not hostile to him or alienated from him; that, on the contrary, they bore him reverence and love; that they were especially grateful to him for the stand he had made against the enemies of the Church, and recognized in his attitude the firmness of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

In reply, the Pope said: "I see yonder (he pointed to the Castle of St. Angelo) the angel sheathing his sword, after having put to flight the powers of evil. Thus did he announce to the people in time past and on this very day the cessation of a pestilence. I see him again to-day putting up his sword at God's bidding, for to-day marks the beginning of the season of mercy. On this day, at the opening of the present century, one of my predecessors was forced from his throne and driven into exile. Those who were his enemies and persecutors were the same who to-day, under the cloak of patriotism, are endeavouring to root out our holy religion from the hearts of men. On this day, too—for the vigil is already begun—July 2, 1849, did a liberating army enter the Holy City and put to flight the enemies of God and of his Church, who desired to abolish the reign of Christ in Rome itself, in the very heart of Catholicity. This day has been regarded as fatal to Rome; but I say that the hour of triumph has already dawned. It has been said that I hate Italy. No; I do not hate her. I have always loved her, always blessed her, always sought her happiness, and God alone knows how long and ardently I have prayed for her. Yes, let us all pray, if I must say so, for this unhappy nation. A nation held together by selfishness can never be united. There can be no blessing on unity if justice and charity be sacrificed; if the rights of all, including God's ministers and his faithful people be trampled under foot. The whole world will cry out against such unity; every one's hand will be raised against it, because God Himself is against it. The hour of triumph gives tokens of its presence, and cannot be long delayed; but should it still be necessary to wait the fulness of its coming, let us bear patiently the trials a just God may send upon us."

The *five hundred bishops* assembled at Rome gave expression to their sentiments in an *address* to the Pope, composed by Archbishop *Haynald,* of Calocsa, in which they said that "they had cheerfully obeyed his summons calling them to Rome, in order to have an opportunity to honour his great virtues, to comfort him in the midst of the trials which afflicted the Church, and to renew the strength of their own hearts by gazing upon his fatherly countenance. The Centenary of St. Peter, they went on to say, was a fresh proof to their minds of the unshaken firmness of the Rock upon which our Divine Saviour built the grand and imperishable edifice of his Church. The Chair of St. Peter, after having survived the ceaseless assaults of its enemies for eighteen hundred years, was still

the organ of truth, the centre of unity, the bulwark of liberty; it had remained at all times unchanged and inviolate, while the thrones of kings and emperors had been overturned and gone to pieces, one after the other, on every side of it. They came, also, impressed with the truth of the convictions and sentiments they had proclaimed five years previously, to show their deep veneration for his person, to give public utterance to their views relative to the maintenance of his Civil Power, the advancement of the cause of religion, and the upholding of the claims of justice, of which he was so intrepid a defender. Their most pleasing, as well as most sacred duty, would be to believe and to teach what he taught and believed; to reject the errors that he rejected; to follow whither he led; to combat at his side; to be ready, like him, to encounter dangers, and trials, and contradictions. Already they discerned tokens of a brighter future in the unequivocal expressions of attachment to the Holy See that came from every quarter of the Christian world; in the signs of affectionate sympathy manifested by all Christendom, which it would be their pleasing duty to encourage by word and example; in the loyalty of the Romans and their obedience to their sovereign temporal and spiritual ruler, to which they could personally bear witness; and in the prospective convocation of an *Œcumenical Council*, which, they would say with *Paul IV.*, 'was the best provision possible against the great dangers that threatened Christian Society.'"

In *reply*, Pius IX. said that it was a great comfort to him to know that this meeting of the bishops had been the occasion of drawing still more closely together the bonds of charity uniting all the churches of the world. He felt confident that having drunk in the true spirit of the Gospel at the tombs of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and St. Paul, the Teacher of the Gentiles, they would go back to their dioceses renewed in strength and equipped to do battle against the forces of the enemy; to defend the rights of religion; and to more successfully unite the peoples committed to their charge in the bonds of Christian charity. Like them, he felt persuaded that no power other than the divine power of the Church could make an effectual stand against the evils of the times, and that this power is never more manifest than when all the bishops, summoned by the Pope, *and presided over by him*, are assembled together to treat of the affairs of the Church.

Expression was simultaneously given to similar sentiments, inspired by the promptings of Catholic faith, in every church in Christendom. Catholics the world over, as if prompted by some unseen power and impelled by divine instinct, joined in the religious solemnities of the occasion. The thought that the Catholic Church had existed for eighteen centuries; that after that lapse of time she presented to the world the imposing spectacle of all her bishops gathered in *harmonious unity* about the tomb and the throne of Peter, filled the hearts of all with confidence in her ultimate and approaching triumph.[1]

On the 11th of April, 1869, Pius IX. again received at Rome, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination in the priesthood, most affectionate tokens of the reverence and love which his children bore him.[2] On the 23rd of August, 1871, when "Pius IX. hath seen the years of Peter," he received still further assurances of the loyalty and devotion of Catholics, which were again renewed on the celebration of his *golden jubilee* as bishop, on the 3rd of June, 1877.[3]

While thus busily engaged in looking after the interests of the Church, the *Great Pontiff* was ever ready *to sympathize with every sorrow, and to assist the afflicted of every land.* Mr. *Maguire*[4] has left

[1] Cfr. *Charles Brandes*, O.S.B., St. Peter in Rome, and Rome without Peter; written in honour of the Eighteenth Centenary Jubilee of the Princes of the Apostles, Our-Lady-of-Hermits, 1867. The Pastorals of Abp. *Herman of Freiburg*, The Papacy in History, and of *Martin*, Bp. of Paderborn, "Christianity and the Papacy." *Pius Gams*, O.S.B., The Year of the Martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Ratisb., 1867. Archbp. *Manning*, The Centenary of St. Peter and the Œcumenical Council (in Germ., Mentz, 1868).

[2] Dr. *de Waal*, Memorial Papers of the Celebration in Rome of the Jubilee of Our Holy Father, and Easter preceding, Munster, 1870. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol LX., pp. 63-67.

[3] See *B. O'Reilly*, Life of Pope Pius IX., pp. 467, 469. (Tr.)

[4] See p. 222.

us an excellent account of his habit of dispensing *charity* wherever he saw want or suffering. In this he but followed the pattern of his predecessors, who were ever zealous to give aid to all Christian peoples to the full extent of their power. This is indeed as it should be, for to whom should we look for fatherly solicitude if not to those who, as faith teaches, are *the Fathers and Teachers of all Christians?* Faithful to the traditions of his predecessors, Pius IX., on the 26th of March, 1847, asked for *prayers* and *contributions* for poor afflicted Ireland; on the 27th of April, 1859, he had prayers offered up for the speedy restoration of peace between *Italy and Austria, then at war;* on the 29th of July, 1860, while a bloody *persecution* was being waged *against the Maronites* in Syria; and on the 18th of October, 1862, during the continuance of the *Civil War* in the *United States* of North America, he also besought all Christians to implore heaven for the cessation of both.

Finally, as a patron of *art*, Pius IX. is both zealous and munificent.[1] During his pontificate numerous and valuable treasures have been exhumed at Rome and at Ostia; and while *Garrucci*, *Cavedoni*, *Visconti Borghese*, and others have industriously pushed forward their inquiries in *archæology*, *De' Rossi* has given to the world his invaluable works on Subterranean Rome.[2] The numerous inscriptions set up in the pontifical museums, and in so many other places in Rome, bear witness to the efforts of Pius IX. in the promotion of art. The encouragement given by him to the publication of the splendid *fac-simile* edition of the Vatican Codex of the Holy Scriptures will serve as an instance of his princely liberality in art, in literature, and the sciences. The various ecclesiastical sciences found able exponents, particularly within the States of the Church. In *philosophy* occur the names of *Liberatore*, S.J.; *Tongiorgi*, S.J.; *San-Severino*, *Taparelli*, and *Kleutzgen*, S.J., who combated the ontologistic and traditionalistic systems of *Rosmini* and *Gioberti*. In *dogmatic theology*, *Perrone*, S.J.; *Passaglia*, S.J.; *Franzelin*, S.J., and others.[3] In *moral theology*, *Scavini* and *Ballerini*, S.J. In *exegetics*, *Patrizi*, S.J.; *Pianciani*, and *Vercellone*. In *church history*, *Theiner*, the Oratorian; *Tosti*, the Benedictine; *Tizzani*, formerly professor at the Sapienza; *Cardoni* and *Cecconi*, the present Archbishop of Florence. In *patrology*, Cardinal *Angelo Mai* and *Ceriani*, of Milan. In *pulpit eloquence*, Father *Ventura*, the Theatine; Canon *Audisio; Curci*, S.J.; *Cucuzza*, O.P.; and *Luigi da Trento*, the Capuchin. And in *canon law*, Mgr. *Chaillot*, who has written chiefly for the *Analata Juris Pontificii; Avanzini*, *Pennacchi*, and *Piazzesi*, the editors of the *Acta S. Sedis*.

[1] *Dr. Sighart*, Relics from Rome, being a contribution to the History of Art, Augsburg, 1865, p. 120.

[2] *Roma Sotterranea*, Rom, 1864-67, 2 T., fol.; Inscriptiones Christianæ.

[3] See p. 157, note 3.

§ 413*a*. *The Twentieth Œcumenical Council of the Vatican and its Immediate Consequences.*.

I. Works Preceding the Council.

H. E. Manning (Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster), The Centenary of St. Peter and the General Council. A Pastoral Letter, London, 1867. (In favour of Infallibility.) *C. H. A. Plantier* (Bishop of Nîmes), Sur les Conciles géné raux à l'occasion de celui que Sa Sainteté Pie IX. a convoqué pour le 8 decembre prochain, Nîmes et Paris 1869 (Infallibilist). Mgr. *V. A. Deschamps* (Archbishop of Malines), L'infaillibilité et le Concile général, 2nd ed., Paris et Malines, 1869 (strong Infallibilist). *H. L. C. Maret* (Dean of the Theol. Faculty of Paris), Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse. Paris, 1869, 2 vols. *W. Em. Baron de Ketteler* (Bishop of Mentz), The General Council and its Import for Our Times, 2 vols (Inopportunist; has since given in). *Dr. Jos. Fessler* (Bishop of St. Pölten and Secretary of the Vatican Council, † 1872), The Last and the Next General Councils, Freiburg, 1869. *F. Dupanloup* (Bishop of Orléans), Lettre sur le future Concile Œcuménique, 1869. The *same*, On the Infallibility of the Pope. First against, then in favour of the Dogma. The Pope and the Council, by *Janus*, London, 1869. Written from the liberal (Old) Catholic stand-point; probably the joint production of Profs. Döllinger, Friedrich, and Huber, of the University of Munich. Dr. J. Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus*, Freiburg, 1870; Engl. by *J. B. Robertson*, Dublin, 1870 (Rom. Cath.) Reformation of the Roman Church in its Head and Members, the Problem to be Solved by the Incoming Roman Council, Lps., 1870. (By Prof. *von Schulte*, of Prague.) Liberal Catholic.

II. Reports During the Council.

The Civiltà Cattolica of Rome for 1869 and 1870 (chief organ of the Infallibilists). *Louis Veuillot*, Rome pendant le Concile, Paris, 1870, 2 vols. Collection of his correspondence to his journal *l'Univers*, of Paris (Ultra-Infallibilist). *J. Friedrich* (Lib. Cath.), Journal of the Vatican Council, Nördlingen, 1871. Its notes, facts, projects, and rumours as they came to the surface. *Lord Acton* (Lib. Cath.), The Vatican Council. First published in the *North British Review* for October, 1870; pp. 95-120 of the Amer. reprint. *Quirinus*, Letters from Rome on the Council, first in the *Augsburg General Gazette*, and then in a separate volume (Munich and London, 1870, p. 856). Compare against Quirinus, Untruths of the Roman Letters on the Council, in the Univ. Gaz., by *W. Em. Baron de Ketteler*, 1870. Ce qui se passe au Concile, dated April 16, 1870, 3rd. ed., Par., 1870 (by *Jules Gaillard*) La dernière heure du Concile, Paris, 1870 (by a member of the Council). The last two works were denounced as a calumny by the presiding cardinals, in the session of July 16, 1870. *Pomponio Leto*, Eight Months at Rome during the Vatican Council; tr. from the Italian, London, 1876. (Adverse to the Council.) Also the Reports during the Council, in the *Giornale di Roma*; the Turin *Unità Cattolica*; the London *Times*; the London (Rom. Cath.) *Tablet*; the Dublin *Review*; the New York *Tribune*.

III. The Acts and Proceedings of the Council.

(1.) *Roman Catholic* (*Infallibilist*) *Sources:* Acta et Decreta ss. et œcum. conc Vaticani, Friburgi Brisgoviæ, 1870 sq.; fasc. I. acta *publica* quibus conc. præ paratum est; fasc. II. acta *publica* ipsius concilii. Additum est lexicon diœceseo residentialium et abbatiarlum "*nullius*," et catalogus Prælatorum Eccles. catho Acta et Decreta ss. œcum conc. Vatic., Rom., 1872, ex typographia Vaticana. "*Th* „ *Œcumenical Council*," Voices (Stimmen) of Maria Laach; new series, Freiburg, 1870. A series of discussions (besides documents, reports, and criticisms) in defence of the Council, by Jesuits (*Florian Riess* and *K. v. Weber*). Atti ufficiali del Concilio œcumenico, Torino, 1870. Actes et histoire du Concile œcuménique de Rome, premier du Vatican, publiés sous la direction de *Victor Frond*, Paris, 1869 sq., 8 vols., fol.; includes extensive biographies of Pope Pius IX. and his Cardinals; of the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, their photographs and autographs; Vol. VIII. contains the Actes, de crets et documents recueillis et mis en ordre par M. *Pelletier*, chanoine d'Orléans. Archbp. *H. E. Manning*, The Vatican Council and its Definitions: a Pastoral Letter to His Clergy, London and New York, 1871. This, together with two other Pastoral Letters on the Council, are published in one volume, Petri Privilegium, London, 1871. Bp. *John Fessler*, The Vatican Council: its Course and Import, Vienna, 1871. By the *same*, The True and the False Infallibility of the Popes, *ibid.*, 1871, and New York, 1875. *M. J. Chantrel*,

Histoire du concile du Vatican, 2nd ed., Paris, 1872. *Conradi* (episcopi Paderbornensis), Omnium concilii Vaticani, quæ ad doctrinam et disciplinam pertinent, documentorum collatio, Paderborn, 1873. Dr. *M. J. Scheeben*, Periodical Papers, Ratisbon, 1870 sq. *Cecconi* (Archbp. of Florence, the official Historian of the Council), Hist. of the Vatican Council; German, Mentz, 1873; English, with additions, by Card. *Manning*. "The True Story of the Vatican Council," London, 1877; Amer. reprint, in the *Catholic Review* of Brooklyn, 1877. The stenographic reports of the speeches of the Council are to remain locked up in the archives of the Vatican until the death of the last member of the Council.

(2.) *Old Catholic* (*Anti-Infallibilist*): *John Friedrich*, Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum, anni 1870, Noerdlingen, 1871, in two parts. Dr. *F. von Schulte* (Professor of Canon Law in the University of Prague, but since 1873 in Bonn). The Infallibility Decree of July 18, 1870, . . . examined, Prague, 1871. Also, "The Power of the Roman Popes over Princes, Countries, Peoples, and Individuals, examined by the Light of their Doctrines and their Acts since the Reign of Gregory VII., to serve for the appreciation of their Infallibility, and set face to face with Contradictory Doctrines of the Popes and the Councils of the First Eight Centuries," Prague, 1871. (Refuted by Bp. Fessler's work on the True and False Infallibility). Suffrages of the Catholic Church on the Eccl. Questions of the Day, Munich, 1870 sq. A Series of Discussions against the Vatican Council, by *Döllinger*, *Huber*, *Schmitz*, *Friedrich*, *Reinkens*, and *Hötzl*.

(3.) *Protestant:* Dr. *Emil Friedberg* (Prof. of Eccl. Law in Lps.), Collection of the Documents concerning the First Council of the Vatican, with a Sketch of its History, Tübingen, 1872. Very valuable; contains all the important documents and a full list of works (written in France, Italy, Germany, and England) on the Council. This collection, although made with the industry of a bee, is still incomplete. *Theodore Frommann* (of Berlin), Hist. and Criticism of the Vatican Council of 1869 and 1870, Gotha, 1872. *E. de Pressensé* (Ref. Pastor in Paris), Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire et ses conséquences politiques et religieuses, Paris, 1872. *L. W. Bacon*, An Inside View of the Vatican Council, New York, 1872. *Dr. Hase* gives an extensive criticism on the Infallibility decree in the 3rd ed. of his *Manual* of Protestant Polemics against the Roman Cath. Church, Lps. 1871, pp. 155-200. Cf. pp. 24-37.

(The above are only the most important works of the large and increasing literature, historical, apologetic, and polemic, on the Vatican Council. *Friedberg* notices, in all, no less than 1,041 writings on the subject till June, 1872. His lists are classified and very accurate.) (Tr.)

Pope Pius IX. first made known his thoughts of holding an Œcumenical Council on the 6th of December, 1864, while presiding at the Vatican Palace over a session of the Congregation of Rites.[1] Two days later he published the Syllabus of Errors and the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*. Between this publication and the convocation of the Vatican Council, men of judgment and ability have professed to find a close and even necessary connection.[2] The Pope imposed silence on the cardinals as to what he had said, and directed them to hand in their opinions on the subject in writing. In expressing their opinions, some of the cardinals spoke particularly of the dominant errors of the present time; of the tendency to exclude God from society and to ignore Him in Science; of the efforts to destroy the idea of a visible Church and to deny both the possibility and the fact of a divine revelation; and of the consequences flowing directly from the withdrawal of civil society and science from the authority of the Church. Others spoke of the importance of holding an Œcumenical Council, setting forth that the condition of the world at the present time was such as to render the holding of a council as necessary as in the age of Luther; that evils were extraordinary, and needed an extraordinary remedy. Others again pointed out the obstacles in the way of holding an Œcumenical Council, indicated the means of setting them aside, and maintained that if a choice had to be made between the holding of a council and the dangers that were likely to surround such an event, the positive good that would be accomplished by the former would far outweigh the evils that might be

---

[1] The True Story of the Vatican Council, by Cardinal *Manning*, London, 1877, p. 3. (Tr.)

[2] In the *Voices* of Maria Laach, preface to the *Œcumenical Council*, new Series, No. 7, it is said: "The intrinsic and essential connection between the Encyclica of December 8, 1864, and the Œcumenical Council, convoked by Pius IX., and to be opened this year, is self-evident. The Council will complete the structure, the foundations of which were laid in the Encyclica."

incident to the latter. Finally, others spoke of the subjects to be treated by the council, suggesting the condemnation of modern errors, the fuller exposition of Catholic teaching, the observance of discipline, and its adaptation to the needs of the present time; but, strange to say, only two spoke of Papal Infallibility, and one of these in a general way in speaking of Gallicanism.[1]

Again, in the early part of March, 1865, Pius IX. appointed a commission to consult, together on the advisability and opportuneness of holding an Œcumenical Council. After conferring together, the consulters recommended that eminent churchmen be called to Rome from every country of the world to lay open the needs of the Church in their respective localities, and to suggest proper remedies; that, to avoid waste of time the subjects likely to be taken up by the council should be designated beforehand, prepared and arranged; and that an extraordinary congregation should be formed, to have full direction of all matters belonging to the council. The resolutions of the commission were submitted to and approved by the Pope, who thereupon created the *Commission* or *Congregation of Direction*, consisting of the five cardinals previously composing the commission, together with a secretary and eight bishops. This Congregation was subsequently distributed into four sections, the first on doctrine, the second on politico-ecclesiastical or mixed questions, the third on missions and the Oriental churches, and the fourth on discipline, each having its headquarters at the office of some already existing Congregation to which its business was most closely allied.[2]

On the 27th of March, 1865, the Pope directed the Secretary of the Congregation of Direction to send letters, under strict secrecy, to some European and Oriental bishops, eminent for learning, asking them to state what questions, in their opinion, ought to be treated by the council. With wonderful unanimity they all designated substantially the same ones, stating that, although there was no specific heresy to be condemned, there was, nevertheless, a general perversion of fundamental truths and a universal confusion as to first principles, and that therefore the council ought to speak out explicitly concerning such truths and principles as underlie the whole of Christianity. They particularly insisted upon an explicit declaration being made concerning the nature and personality of God; upon the possibility and fact of a divine revelation; and upon the relations of the Church to civil governments and of Christian civilization to modern progress.[3]

On the 17th of November, 1865, the nuncios at Paris, Vienna, Madrid, Munich, and Brussels were informed by letter of the intention of Pius IX. to hold an Œcumenical Council, and directed to give their opinion as to its opportuneness, and to forward the names of two theologians or canonists of special name in the countries to which they were respectively accredited. No day had as yet been fixed upon for the opening of the council, although the 29th of June, 1867, had at one time been thought of; but the war-cloud that was gathering on the horizon of Europe warned the Pope to put off the event to some future day. Here the affair of holding an Œcumenical Council rested for the present. On the 8th of December, 1866, a circular letter was written to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, inviting them to come to Rome to celebrate the Centenary in the following year; and on the 6th of June, 1867, Cardinal *Caterini*, Prefect of the Congregation of the Council,[4] sent a circular to all the bishops, containing a schedule of seventeen important points on morals and discipline, in each of which they were requested to hand in their opinions within four months. These related chiefly to the sacredness of Christian marriage; to the tone required in the Christian pulpit, and the necessity of taking revealed truth as the basis of all sermons and instructions; to the importance of having schools under Christian influences; to the necessity of a higher standard of studies in ecclesiastical seminaries; to the means of securing a more advanced culture in both sacred and profane knowledge among the clergy; to the policy of encouraging the increase of Religious Congregations, whose members are bound only by simple vows; to the best means of providing for worthy appointments to bishoprics and parishes; and to the lawful exercise of episcopal authority over the inferior clergy. Reference was also made to the duty of excluding non-Catholics from the office of sponsors at baptism, and from menial services in Catholic families, and to the removal of abuses in connection with Catholic cemeteries.[5]

---

[1] The True Story of the Vatican Council, pp. 4-12. (Tr.)

[2] *Ibid.*, L. c., pp. 12, 22, and 71. (Tr.)

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-36. (Tr.)

[4] Established by Pius IV. to interpret the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. (Tr.)

[5] The Circular of the Cardinal, *ibid.*, No. 3, pp. 7-10 and in Acta et Decreta Conc. Vat., fasc. I., p. 22.

By many of the bishops this document was communicated to their priests, and in this way the Catholic Church throughout the world was in a measure prepared for the convocation of an Œcumenical Council. Pius IX. first *publicly* announced his intention of convoking an Œcumenical Council in a Consistory held, on account of the great number present, in the tribune above the atrium of St. Peter's, on the 26th of June, 1867, and attended by the five hundred bishops who had come to Rome to take part in the solemnities of the Centenary of SS. Peter and Paul. The bishops, in their reply, delivered in an audience of the 1st of July, said, "that their souls were filled with the greatest joy when they learned from his own mouth that, notwithstanding the difficulties of the times, he still determined to convoke an Œcumenical Council, in order, in the words of his illustrious predecessor, Paul III., that '*a supreme remedy might be applied to the supreme dangers that threaten Christianity.*'"[1] In publicly announcing his intention to convoke a council, Pius IX. omitted to fix the day of opening. This he did in a Secret Consistory, held on the 22nd of June, 1868, when, after having asked the cardinals if, in their opinion, it was expedient to promulgate, on the coming 29th of June, the convocation of an Œcumenical Council, to convene on the 8th of December, 1869, and having received an unanimously affirmative answer, he bade them pray from that time for the special aid of the Holy Ghost.[2]

Accordingly, on the Feast of the Princes of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, Pius IX. published the Bull of Indiction,[3] *Æterni Patris*, announcing to the world the convocation of an Œcumenical Council, to convene in the Vatican on the 8th of December, 1869, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. At the close of the form of convocation the bull goes on: "Hence we will and command that all the Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops everywhere, so also the beloved sons, the Abbots, and all other persons whose right or privilege it is to take part in General Councils, come to this Œcumenical Council convoked by Us." The bull then states that those who are under obedience to be at the Council, and absent themselves without just cause, of which the Procurators of the Synod are to be the judges, are liable to penalties which it is both lawful and customary to inflict in such cases. Then follows this paragraph: "In this confidence we hope that God, in whose hands are the hearts of men, will, by His ineffable mercy and grace, bring it to pass that all sovereign princes and rulers of all peoples, above all, such as are Catholic . . . will, not only not hinder our venerable brethren from coming to the Council, but, as becomes Catholic princes, earnestly favour them and give them help." The bull, as a whole, is very like that published by Paul III. in 1542, convoking the Council of Trent, except that the work to be accomplished was stated with rather more terseness and precision in the latter than in the former. The task of the Vatican Council is thus drawn out by Pius IX.: "In this Œcumenical Council must be examined with the greatest accuracy and decreed, all things which, especially in these rough times, relate to the greater glory of God, the integrity of the faith, the splendour of divine worship, the eternal salvation of man, the discipline of the secular and regular clergy, their wholesome and solid culture, the observance of ecclesiastical laws, the amendment of manners, the instruction of youth, and the common peace and concord of all. And, with God's help, a most earnest endeavour must be made to avert all evils from the Church and from civil society, and to bring back those who are unhappily straying away to the straight path of truth, justice, and salvation; to the end that, when vice and error are removed, our august religion and its saving doctrines may be revived over the whole earth, and spread from day to day until their empire is complete, that thus piety, honesty, probity, justice, charity, and all Christian virtues that are of greatest utility to human society may acquire fresh strength and new beauty. For no one can deny that the power of the Catholic Church and of her doctrine is exerted, not alone for the salvation of men, but also for the temporal well-being of peoples, their true prosperity, order, and tranquillity, and for the progress and solidity of human sciences, as the annals of both sacred and profane history clearly and plainly show by luminous facts."

On the 8th of September, 1868, a letter of invitation, beginning *Arcanæ divinæ Providentiæ*, was sent to *all the bishops of the Churches of the Oriental Rite who are not in communion with the Apostolic See.* In this letter Pius IX. stated that, "being the successor of the blessed Prince of the Apostles, who, 'in virtue of the prerogatives conferred upon him by God, is the firm and most solid rock upon which the Saviour built his Church,'

---

[1] Card. *Manning*, Petri Privilegium, Pt. I., p. 124. (Tr.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, The True Story, &c., p. 62. (Tr.)

[3] In the Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., p. 48 sq.; and in the Voices of Maria-Laach, new series, No. I., pp. 7-15.

it was his urgent duty to extend his care to every part of the world inhabited by Christians, and his earnest wish and desire to excite in all a yearning to return to the embraces of fatherly charity." He added: "Our thoughts have been constantly upon those Churches which, when united of old with the Apostolic See, enjoyed so high a reputation for holiness and heavenly doctrine, and brought forth fruits so abundantly for the glory of God and the salvation of souls; but which now, through the wicked arts and contrivances of him, who was the author of the first schism in heaven, remains, to our great sorrow, cut off and separate from the communion of the Holy Roman Church, spread over the whole earth." After referring to a fruitless letter, addressed to them in the beginning of his pontificate, and expressing his determination never to lose hope, the Pope continues: "Having convoked an Œcumenical Council, to be opened in Rome next year on the 8th of Dec., the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God, we again call upon you, and do most earnestly entreat, admonish, and implore you to be good enough to come to this general synod, as your predecessors came to the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and to the Council of Florence (1439), that the bonds of ancient friendship being renewed and peace restored, the long night of darkness and sorrow may be dispelled, and the cheering light of longed-for union shine forth to all."[1] The Patriarch of the Orthodox Greek Church, to whom this letter was presented, did not even open it,[2] but, on the other hand, neither did the remonstrance drawn up by a schismatical priest of Ceos in Bithynia, against the "arrogance of the Pope," meet with any favour. The movement among the Armenians towards a union with Rome, occasioned by the invitation of the Pope, and headed by the Armenian Catholic Patriarch at Constantinople, was thwarted by intrigue and violence.[3]

On the 13th of September, 1868, the Pope published an invitation to *Protestants* and other non-Catholics, believing in Jesus Christ, but not of the fold of the Church. All such, he said, "he admonished, exhorted, and besought to seriously ask themselves if they were walking in the path pointed out by Christ the Lord, which leads to eternal life. And no one can deny," he goes on to say, "or doubt that Christ Jesus, in order to apply the fruits of his Redemption to all generations of the human family, has built his only Church here on earth upon Peter; that is to say, the one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, to which He has granted all necessary power to preserve whole and inviolate the deposit of faith, and to extend this same faith to all peoples, and races, and nations, to the end that, all men being made members of his Mystical Body by baptism, the new life of grace, without which no one can ever merit or secure eternal life, may be continued and made perfect; and that this same Church, which is his Mystical Body, may remain stable and unchanged to the end of time, and supply to all her children the sure means of salvation. Now, anyone attentively considering and weighing the condition of the various and discordant religious societies separated from the Catholic Church . . . should be easily led to conclude that no single one of them, nor all of them together, can by any manner be that one and Catholic Church which Christ the Lord built and constituted; neither can they by any means be said to be a branch or a part of that Church, since, as is plain, they are separated from Catholic unity. For, because these societies are destitute of that living authority, established by God for the special purpose of instructing men in the doctrines of faith and the precepts of morals, and directing and ruling them in all that pertains to eternal life, they are ceaselessly changing their teachings . . . And everyone knows that from these doctrinal dissensions and conflicts of opinion arise social schisms, and from these again countless religious bodies and sects daily spring up, to the great detriment of both Church and State. . . . Hence let all, who have not the unity and truth of the Catholic Church, embrace the occasion of this Council, . . . which affords a fresh proof of the Church's close unity, and of the undying vitality of her strength, to satisfy the cravings of their own hearts by rising from their present condition, in which they can have no security of their salvation. Let them pray most fervently to the God of mercies, that He will be pleased to pull down the walls of separation, to dispel the darkness of error, and to lead them back to the bosom of Holy Mother Church, in which their forefathers were fed upon the saving Bread of Life, and in which alone the teaching of Jesus Christ is preserved intact and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed." By the great bulk of the Protestants this invitation, breathing such earnestness and love, was received with derision and contempt. Some of the most zealous and

---

[1] Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 54, 55; *Voices*, L. c., pp. 15-18.

[2] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 73. (Tr.)

[3] Cf. *Voices*, 1869, No. I., p. 40 sq.; No. 3, p. 31 sq.; *Friedberg*, p. 12.

bigoted, and notably superintendents and members of provincial consistories, claiming to be in possession of the pure evangelical doctrine, took offence at the tone of the Pope, peremptorily rejected his invitation, and avenged themselves by making a number of serious charges against both the Church and her Head. A few earnest and thoughtful men were disposed to recognize the rights of the Father of Christendom to send out such an invitation, and were correspondingly grateful. Among these were: In Germany, *Baumstark*, Counsellor *Reinold* of Constance, and *Wolfgang Menzel*, of Stuttgart; *Guizot*, in France; and in England, *Dr. Pusey*.[1]

To insure the divine blessing upon the council, the Holy Father invoked the aid of *prayer*. Having, he said, himself called unceasingly upon the Father of light, the Dispenser of mercies, and the Giver of every good, to grant that the gift of wisdom might be given to him and abide with him and work through him, so also did he desire to arouse the piety and stimulate the devotion of the faithful of Christ, *by proclaiming an indulgence in the manner of a jubilee*, in the hope that all would unite their prayers with his in imploring God to illuminate the council with the light of heaven, and thus guide it to enact what would most promote the general well-being of all Christian peoples, advance the interests of the Catholic Church, and secure her peace and prosperity.[2]

During the winter of 1868 and 1869 many theologians were called to Rome from the various parts of Italy, from France and Belgium, Germany and England, and Spain and North America, to assist in the work of *immediate preparation* for the council. These were distributed into six commissions,[3] viz., the Commission on Rites and Ceremonies, the Commission on Mixed or Politico-ecclesiastical Questions, the Commission on Foreign Missions and the East, the Commission on Religious Orders, the Commission on Dogma, and the Commission on Discipline, each of which, presided over by a cardinal, was engaged in preparing subjects belonging to its province for the council. The strict obligation of secrecy was laid upon all the consultors. Two questions of vital importance now came before the Commission of Direction: first, were bishops, having no ordinary jurisdiction, such as vicars-apostolic, entitled to sit in the council and to have a decisive vote; and, second, to whom belonged the right of prescribing the order or method by which the proceedings of the council should be regulated.

To the first it was answered that in the bulls by which preceding councils were convoked no distinction was made, the form of the summons running "archbishops and bishops," and that therefore none should now be made. The decision of the second question was not so easy, some of the bishops contending that this right belonged to the Fathers of the Council; but, after a careful examination of the precedents of former councils, it was decided, on the 29th of June, 1869, "that the right of regulating the Council belonged to the authority which convened it, and that it was the highest prudence to retain that right in the hands of him who is the Head, not only of the Council, but of the Church."[4] Accordingly, on the 27th of November, 1869, this decision may be said to have been made part of the law of the Church by the publication of the bull *Multiplices inter*, prescribing the rules governing the proceedings and the members of the council, or, in a wide sense, indicating the *Order of Business*.[5] One of the most important paragraphs

---

[1] *Friedberg*. pp. 12-16; *Voices*, No. 4, p. 92 sq.; *Baumstark*, Reflections of a Protestant on the Pope's Invitation to a Reunion with the Catholic Church. Cf. Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 63-65.

[2] *Voices*, 1869, No. IV., pp. 5-12.

[3] For the names of those composing the various Commissions, see *Voices*, 1869, No. II., p. 69 sq.

[4] Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 72-74. (Tr.)

[5] Acta et Decreta, fasc. II., pp. 66-74, Œcum. Council; *Voices*, No. VI., pp. 10-24. Cf. *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, pp. 33-42. The bull *Multiplices inter*, providing for the regulation of the affairs of the Council, is divided into ten sections, as follows: I. De modo vivendi, in Concilio; II. De jure et modo proponendi; III. De secreto servando in Concilio; IV. De ordine sedendi et de non inferendo alicui præjudicio, i. e., establishing the order of rank and precedence; V. De judicibus excusationum et querelarum, i. e., appointing a Commission on Excuses to decide upon the excuses sent by bishops not present and upon those sent in by bishops desiring to leave, and a second Commission on Disputes, to settle any questions that may arise relative to rank and precedence; VI. De officialibus Concilii, i. e., providing for the appointment and duties of the officers belonging to the Council; VII. De congregationibus generalibus Patrum; VIII. De sessionibus publicis, an account of which is given in the text; IX. De non dis-

of this bull is the second, "*On the right and method of introducing matters to be treated.*" All questions that might come before the council could not of course be foreseen by the Commission of Direction, and it was necessary, in order to save time and avoid confusion to have some regular channel through which new subjects might be brought before the council. A *Commission on Postulates*, consisting of six-and-twenty cardinals and bishops, eminent for experience and prudence, was therefore appointed by the Pope, and every bishop desiring to propose a new subject in council was required to lay it before this commission in the form of a written petition to the Pontiff. The efficiency of such a play no one will deny; neither can there be any just suspicion of unfairness, for it seems morally impossible that six-and-twenty prudent bishops would be adverse to bringing forward any matter really worth being proposed to the council.[1]

Another point of vital importance was the mode of discussion and voting provided for in the two paragraphs of the bull *Multiplices inter*, entitled, respectively, *On the General Congregations of the Fathers* and *On Public Sessions*. It was as follows: The preparatory labours of the Commission of Direction and its theologians and canonists were sifted and arranged into *schemata* or draft-decrees, which were wholly the work of the bishops who prepared them, and had no supreme sanction whatever. Printed copies of the *schemata* were distributed to the Fathers of the council as a basis of discussion, which was conducted as follows: At the outset of the council the Fathers were to elect by secret vote four special Congregations or Deputations, viz.: 1. On Faith; 2. On Discipline; 3. On Regular Orders; and, 4. On the Affairs of the Eastern Church, consisting each of twenty-four members, and continuing to exercise their functions during the time the council was in session.[2] Each Father was to be in possession of the *schemata* some days, ten at least, before discussion upon them was opened. These *schemata* were at first discussed in the *General Congregations* of the whole council, where, if any particular *schema* was accepted as a whole, it was next taken up paragraph by paragraph and clause by clause. If, on the contrary, it provoked discussion, the arguments on both sides, as taken down in short-hand, were referred to the one of the four Commissions to which the subject in question belonged. The whole *schema* was now examined in the light of the arguments brought out in the discussion, amended or recast, printed, and again brought before the General Congregation by one of the members of the Commission, selected for the purpose. If the *schema* needed further corrections or amendments, the same process was repeated, and so on until a satisfactory *schema* was obtained. The final verdict on a *schema* was, of course, determined by vote, which was taken in the following manner: Those voting *aye* said *placet;* those voting *no*, *non-placet;* and those voting *aye*, with a condition or qualification, said *placet juxta modum*. The last kind of vote was permitted only in General Congregations, not in Public Sessions, and those who so voted were required to send in, in writing, their correction or amendment, which was printed, submitted to the Commission, and voted upon at the next General Congregation.[3]

On the 20th of February, 1870, a *decree* was published, containing some further rules, which, while providing for full freedom of discussion, were designed to prevent irrelevant and useless controversy, to make the debates more orderly and direct, and to save time and expedite business. These just limitations gave offence to some, who regarded them as strictures on their freedom of speech and action; but it is difficult, on reading them over, to view them as other than wise regulations, admirably adapted for the guidance and government of such a body as the Vatican Council. The rules governing the debates in the American Congress or the British Parliament do not allow a wider liberty, and are not nearly so simple and precise.

Some of the bishops also thought that the provisions of the Constitution *Apostolicæ Sedis moderationi*, signed by the Pope October 12, 1869, and published as a part of the *law* of the Church on the 14th of December, abrogating a number of *censures*,[4] not applicable to the changed circumstances of these times, should have been incorporated in one of the *schemata*, and brought before the council; and, because this was not done, a few began to express their fears that their freedom would be restrained. It is not easy to understand

---

cedendo a Concilio; X. Indultum apostolicum de non-residentia pro iis qui Concilio intersunt, i. e., exempting by apostolic indult those who were engaged at the Council from the usual penalties attaching to absence from their benefices.

[1] Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 75, 78, and 89. (Tr.)

[2] See the bull *Multiplices inter*, sec. VII. De Congregationibus generalibus Patrum. (Tr.)

[3] Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 78-80. (Tr.)

[4] Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 77-85; Œcum. Counc., *Voices*, No. VII., pp. 10-17.

why the exercise of a papal prerogative, which at any other time would have excited no comment, should then be taken as indicating a purpose to control the action of an Œcumenical Council.

Having now given the history of the origin of the Vatican Council and of the events that preceded its opening, it only remains to mention the subjects to be laid before it, and to speak more or less in detail of *papal infallibility*, which, though it was never mentioned by the Pope in connection with the proceedings of the council, nor suggested by any of the Consultors, except by one or two incidentally, nor explicitly contained in any of the *schemata*, seemed, nevertheless, the one question that was uppermost in the minds of men.

Of the subjects to be brought before the council, it will be sufficient to give the *schemata* prepared by the theologians and canonists of the Commission of Direction. They were as follows: "1. Schema on Catholic Doctrine against the manifold errors flowing from Rationalism; 2. Schema on the Church of Christ; 3. Schema on the Office of Bishops; 4. Schema on the Vacancy of Sees; 5. Schema on the Life and Manners of the clergy; 6. Schema on the Little Catechism.[1]

For some years previously to the convocation of the Vatican Council, parties hostile to the prerogatives of the Holy See had existed in both France and Germany. In the former country the immediate occasion of their hostility was the condemnation of certain errors in politics by Gregory XVI.; in the latter the condemnation of certain errors in science by Pius IX. These parties had been steadily growing in number and gaining in strength up to the moment of the celebration of the Centenary in 1867. Five hundred bishops on that occasion emphatically affirmed the Pope's prerogatives in the most ample way, stating that "Peter spoke by the mouth of Pius;" that whatever Pius "spoke, confirmed, and pronounced for the safe custody of the deposit," they likewise "spoke, confirmed, and pronounced;" and that, "with one voice and one mind," they rejected whatever he had "judged fit to reprove and reject."[2] It is not surprising, therefore, that this declaration, taken in connection with the convocation of an Œcumenical Council, should have alarmed and stimulated to renewed activity those who, believing that the prerogatives of the Holy See were already too extensive, were engaged in a strenuous effort to force them within narrower limits by withdrawing political and scientific questions from the jurisdiction of the Church. With the instinct of error, they discovered the quarter from which to apprehend danger, and at once began a malignant war on papal infallibility, although, as has been seen, the subject had not been even mentioned by either the Pope or anyone officially connected with the Council. Everything was done that could be done to prevent papal infallibility from being promulgated as a dogma. Its opponents held conferences, organized, matured an elaborate system of attack, divided their forces, apportioned the labour according to the gifts and qualifications of individuals, those of one country kept up an active correspondence with their allies in every other, and, in 1868, a work entitled *Janus* appeared in Germany, which, as Cardinal Manning says, was "an elaborate attempt of many hands to destroy by profuse misrepresentation of history the authority of the Pope, and to create animosity against the future Council.[3]

The *Schema* on the Church of Christ contained only two chapters on the Head of the Church, the first on the Primacy and the second on the Temporal Power. No more had been prepared in the beginning of the year 1869. The Commission, taking up the subject again at this date, found it impossible to treat the Primacy without at the same time treating its endowments, and, as a consequence, the question of infallibility. Hence, on the 11th of February, when the subject was reached, two questions came up for discussion: 1. *Can* the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff be defined as an article of *faith?* 2. *Ought* it to be so defined? To the first question the Consultors answered unanimously in the affirmative; to the second, all but one answered indirectly that it ought not be brought before the council except at the request of the bishops.[4]

While the Consultors were still at work on the additional chapters of the *Schema* on the Church of Christ, a correspondence from France, dated February 6, 1869, appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, in which the writer predicted that the council would be of short duration, and stated that it was the unanimous wish of all Catholics to have the teachings of the *Syllabus* formally enunciated and the infallibility of the Pope proclaimed by acclamation. In commenting on the article in the Civiltà, *The Catholic* of Mentz[5] said

---

[1] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 82. (Tr.)
[2] *Ibid.*, L. c., p. 51. (Tr.)
[3] *Ibid.*, L. c., p. 67 sq. (Tr.)
[4] *Ibid*, L. c., p. 83. (Tr.)
[5] *La Civiltà Cattolica*, anno XXmo, p. 352. (Tr.) "*The Catholic*," year 1869, Vol. I., p. 727.

that the sentiments there expressed had been promptly disavowed by the highest authorities in Rome; that even the General of the Jesuits declined to give them his approval; and that words penned by some over-zealous and imprudent writers, and sanctioned by a few others, should not be taken as an authoritative utterance on the line of action to be pursued by the council. Still the article was generally regarded as significant, and the discussion of the subject was taken up everywhere. Simultaneously in France, Germany, and Belgium, in England and the United States, the columns of newspapers and periodicals were crowded with editorials on the subject, and pamphlets and treatises came from the Press in hurried succession, nearly all the opposition writers drawing their weapons of attack from the armoury supplied by *Janus* in the preceding year. The excitement was steadily on the increase, and nothing was left undone to prevent a return of men's minds to sobriety and calmness. An article, entitled the *Council and the Civiltà*, which appeared in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* on the 10th of March, 1869,[1] so alarmed the fears of even well-meaning educated laymen, that a number of them, then attending the Parliament in Berlin, thought it their duty to send an address to the bishops assembled at Fulda, expressing their misgivings. The bishops, in consequence, published a *Pastoral Letter*,[2] in which they said that "an Œcumenical Council could never, by any possibility, proclaim as a dogma a doctrine not contained in Holy Writ and Apostolic Traditions, and that the Church, in giving decisions on matters of faith, does not promulgate new doctrines at all, but sets old truths in a clearer light, thus guarding them against fresh errors." The bishops of Austria, Hungary, France, and other countries issued pastoral letters of a like character, assuring their flocks that the aims and purposes of the Holy See had been grossly misrepresented. Bishop Dupanloup went the length of saying that extravagant opinions were wafted from France across the Alps; that wisdom and moderation came from Rome. Infallibility became a subject of disquieting anxiety, even in diplomatic circles. A document, bearing date of April 9, 1869, signed by Prince Hohenlohe, the Bavarian minister, but written by an abler hand, was sent to all the governments of Europe, inviting their co-operation in a combined attempt to oppose the council. "The only dogmatic thesis," he said, "which Rome would wish to have decided by the council . . . is the infallibility of the Pope."[3] Such were some of the attempts made to misrepresent, intimidate, and overawe the council. Every sort of argument was made use of to convey to the world a wrong notion of its aims and purposes. The whole world seemed arrayed and banded against it, and, as the day of its opening drew near, the violence and malignity of the opposition increased. Still the preparations for the council went steadily forward, heedless of this multitudinous clamour of angry tongues.

The Bull of Indiction was promulgated June 29, 1868, and by the day set for the opening, December 8, 1869, the bishops and apostolic vicars from the most remote countries had arrived in Rome. They were there from California and Mexico; from Brazil, Peru, Chili, and New Granada; from the Philippine Islands and Australia; and from India, Siam, Tunkin, China, and Japan.

Pius IX. considerately provided for the suitable support of the more indigent of the prelates. By the middle of December the number of the Fathers had risen to above seven hundred, but was considerably reduced during the progress of the council by death and other causes. At the *Third Public Session*, held April 24, 1870, there were present only six hundred and sixty-seven, of whom 43 were cardinals, 9 patriarchs, 8 primates, 107 archbishops, 456 bishops, 1 administrator of a diocese, 6 privileged abbots, 20 abbots-generals, and 43 superiors-generals of Religious Orders and Congregations.[4] Over the

---

[1] Number 69. See also *Acton*, L. c., p. 18 sq., "Attitude of Statesmen before the Opening of the Council."

[2] It was signed by twenty-one bishops and proxies. The ext is given in the *Voices*, 1869, Nos. V.-X., followed by pastoral letters from other countries.

[3] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 68. (Tr.)

[4] For further classification and statements by countries, see *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, pp. 15-20. Of the 107 archbishops, e. g., there were 23 Greeks and Orientals (8 Armenians, 5 Chaldeans, 4 Maronites, 3 Syrians, 1 Greek 1 Greek Melchite, and 1 Roumanian); 23 Italians and 46 from other countries (10 from France, 10 from North America, 3 from Austria, 3 from Germany, 2 from Ireland, 2 from Belgium and Holland, and 1 from England; finally, 15 archbishops *in partibus infidelium*. Of the 456 bishops, 293 are to be booked for Europe, viz., 122 for Italy (of whom but few cobishops), 61 for France, 31 for Spain, 18 for the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, 16 for Ireland, 15 for Germany, 11 for England and Scotland, 9 for Turkey and Greece 7 for Switzerland, with

Four Public Sessions the Pope presided in person, while the *General Congregations* were presided over by five Cardinal Presidents, appointed by him. Cardinal *Von Reisach* was First President, and with him were associated Cardinals *De Luca*, *Bizarri*, *Bilio*, and *Capalti*. Cardinal *Von Reisach* died in Savoy, after a short illness, on Christmas Day, 1869, and Cardinal *De Angelis* was named First President in his room. Bishop *Fessler*, of St. Polten, had been appointed Secretary of the council before its opening.

§ 413*b*. *The Vatican Council and its Immediate Consequences.*

At a *Preliminary Congregation* (*Congregatio prosynodalis*), held in the Sistine Chapel, December 2, 1869, Pius IX., who presided, said he could not put in words the great joy he felt at seeing gathered about him so many bishops from all parts of the Catholic world, and that his joy was so much the greater in that he felt they were bound to him by the same bond of love that bound the Disciples to their Master. He said they were come together to provide remedies for the great evils that threatened Christian and Civil Society in these times, and prayed that the blessing of God might fall upon them and upon their work.[1] After the *Allocution*, the names of the Cardinal Presidents and other officials were made known, and the *Constitution* for the regulation of the council distributed to the bishops.[2]

On the 8th of December the council was solemnly opened by a PUBLIC SESSION in the Council Hall in the transept, on the right-hand side of the Basilica of St. Peter. After the *Veni Creator* had been sung and *High Mass* said, the Book of Gospels was placed upon the altar, where it remained open throughout the Session. A sermon was then preached, followed by the Synodal prayers, which were intoned by the Holy Father, and the Litany of the Saints. After the Gospel, the Pope made an *Allocution*,[3] in which he said: "Our heart rejoices and is glad with an exceeding great joy to see you, Venerable Brethren, gathered here in the citadel of the Catholic Religion, and on this holy and most auspicious Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in greater number than ever before. You are here in the name of Jesus Christ, to bear witness with us to the Word of God; to declare with us the truth to all men, which is the way that leads to God; and to condemn with us, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the doctrines of false science. You are aware, Venerable Brethren, of the violence of the assaults made by the old enemy of the human race against the House of God, which should be adorned with holiness. But, as St. John Chrysostom has said: 'Nothing is more powerful than the Church; she is stronger than heaven itself. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' Be ye therefore strengthened in the Lord; and, sanctified in truth and clad with the armour of light, teach the way, the truth, and the life. God is present in his holy place; He is with us in our deliberations and our efforts; He has chosen us to be his servants and fellow-workers in this great work of his salvation. Therefore, knowing well our own weakness, and filled with mistrust of ourselves, we lift up our eyes and our prayers to Thee, O Holy Ghost, to Thee, the source of true light and wisdom."[4]

After the *Veni Creator* had been again sung, the Bishop of Fabriano read from the *Ambo* the decree of the opening of the Council, of which the following is the substance: "Is it the pleasure of the Fathers that the Œcumenical Council should be opened and should be declared open for the glory of the Most Holy Trinity, the custody and declaration of the faith and of the Catholic religion; for the condemnation of errors, which are widely spreading, and for the moral correction of clergy and people?" When the Fathers had unanimously answered *Placet*, the Pope declared the Council opened, and fixed the *Second Public Session* for the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1870. Preparatory to it four *General Congregations* were held on the 10th, 14th, 20th, and 28th days of December. In the first of these the names of those composing the Commission

---

the bishops' substitutes of Geneva, Choire, and of the Abbey of Saint Maurice (in the Valais), 5 for Belgium and Holland, and 2 for Portugal.

[1] See the Allocution of December 2nd. (TR.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 86. (TR.)

[3] Both documents, the Pope's Allocution and the Sermon of the day, in the Acta et Decreta concilii Vaticani, fasc. II., pp. 144-153. Œcumenical Council, *Voices* from Maria-Laach, 1869, 1870, No. VI., pp. 24-42.

[4] See Allocution of December 8th. (TR.)

on Postulates were made known, after which the five Judges of Excuses (*Judices excusationum*) were elected by the universal vote of the Council, and the *Schema* on *Catholic Doctrine* against the manifold errors flowing from Rationalism distributed to the Fathers. Five *Judices Querelarum*, for the determination of questions of rank and precedence, were also chosen, and the Constitution of December 4th, in which the Pope made provisions against the event of his death during the continuance of the Council, communicated to the Fathers.[1] In the second General Congregation, the members of the *Commission on Faith*, twenty-four in number,[2] were voted for, after which the Papal Constitution, *Apostolicæ Sedis moderationi*, already mentioned, was laid before the Fathers. In the Third General Congregation, the result of the vote for members of the Commission on Faith was made known, and an equal number elected for the *Commission on Discipline*. In the fourth General Congregation the same number were chosen to serve on the *Commission on Religious Orders*, after which the discussion was opened on the first Schema on Catholic Doctrine, and continued in the General Congregation held on the 30th of December, 1869, and the 3rd and 4th of January, 1870, but without reaching any definite result. Hence, in the SECOND PUBLIC SESSION, the Fathers could do no more than make the *Profession of Faith*, according to the formulary of the Council of Trent. The members of all councils, from that of Constantinople, in 381, where the Creed of the Council of Nicæa was repeated, down to the Council of the Vatican, have uniformly been required to make such profession. First the Pope rose, and facing the Fathers, the Book of Gospels being open on the Altar and the Tomb of St. Peter uncovered, read from his throne, in a loud, clear voice, the profession of the faith of Trent. The Bishop of Fabriano then read the same from the *Ambo*. The cardinals, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and other Fathers of the Council, next signified their adhesion to this as their common faith by advancing and reverently kissing the Book of Gospels, open at the throne of the Pope. This seemed the fulfilment of the prayers of our Lord, "that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; *that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.*"[3]

The first discussion on the *Schema* on Catholic Doctrine was closed at the *General Congregation* held January 10. Thirty-five Fathers had spoken, and the *Schema*, with their speeches and proposed amendments, was sent back to the Commission on Faith to be entirely recast. In the meantime the Fathers took up in the General Congregations the disciplinary *Schemata on the Vacancy of Sees, on the Life and Manners of the Clergy*, and *on the Little Catechism*. The first was discussed in seven General Congregations between the 14th and 25th of January, in which thirty-seven spoke; the second also in seven, between the 25th of January and the 8th of February, in which thirty-eight spoke; and the last in six, between the 10th and 22nd of February, in which forty-one spoke.[4] These *Schemata*, with the speeches and amendments were then sent back to the Commission on Discipline. At the close of the last of these General Congregations, the Decree, already mentioned, containing some additional regulations, drawn up by the Commission on Postulates, intended to make the discussions more orderly, rigorous, and expeditious, was communicated to the Fathers. These rules provided that bishops desiring to make any

---

[1] Acta et decreta, pp. 95-98; Œcumenical Council, *Voices*, No. VII., pp. 5-9.

[2] These were: The Roman, *Cardoni*, Archbishop of Edessa, in part, and the Archbishop of Modena, the Bishop of Treviso, and the Bishop of Calvi, from Italy; the Bishops Senestrey of Ratisbon, and Martin of Paderborn, from Germany; the Archbishop of Cambray and the Bishop of Poitiers, from France; the Archbishop of Saragossa and the Bishop of Jaen, in Spain; Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, from England; the Archbishop of Cashel, from Ireland; the Archbishop of Utrecht, Archbishop Deschamps of Malines, Archbishop Ledochowsky of Posen-Gnesen, and Primate of Poland; the Bishop of Sion or Sitten in Switzerland; the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia, from Asia Minor, and the Archbishop of Bostra and Administrator of East India, from Eastern Asia; Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, and Archbishop Alemany, of San Francisco, from North America; the Archbishop of Santiago in Chili, and the Bishop of Rio Grande de San Pedro in Brazil, from South America. Cardinal *Bilio* was made President of this committee. For the members of the *other committees*, see *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, pp. 56-61.

[3] John, xvi., 20, 21.

[4] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 96. It would seem, from the dates given above, that Card. Manning is incorrect in saying that these *Schemata* were discussed *after* the Third Public Session. (TR.)

changes or corrections in the *Schema* previously distributed to them should do so *in writing*, first, on the *Schema* as a whole, and secondly on the chapters and paragraphs in detail; that after these proposed amendments had been printed and put into the hands of each of the Fathers, the Cardinal Presidents should fix a day for the opening of the discussion; that those wishing to speak should hand in their names to the Cardinal Presidents, and also state whether they were going to speak on the *Schema* as a whole or on one of its chapters, and if the latter, which one; that if any of the speakers spoke wide of the question, the Presidents might remind him of the fact; and, finally, that if it was clear the discussion was being uselessly prolonged, the Cardinal Presidents, at the written request of any ten of the Fathers, might, by a vote of the Congregation, decide whether it should go on or be closed.[1] As the *Schema on Catholic Doctrine* had not yet been completed, the second dogmatic *Schema on the Church of Christ* was distributed to the Fathers. As originally drawn up, it consisted of three Parts and fifteen Chapters.[2] By the new rules of debate, the Fathers had at least ten days to hand in their views and criticisms in writing. In the present case this period closed on March 4th. About one hundred and twenty papers were handed in on Chapters I. to X., including many memorials against the new rules, signed jointly by a number of bishops, the lowest list of signatures being four, and the highest twenty-nine. It has been already seen that that portion of the *Schema on the Church of Christ* treating of the Head of the Church contained only two chapters, the one on his Primacy and the other on his Temporal Power. To complete the subject, many of the bishops desired to introduce a new chapter on Papal Infallibility. The lawful way to do this was to send a petition to the Commission on Postulates, asking leave to introduce such a chapter. A petition was accordingly drawn up, to which were subsequently added extracts from Provincial Councils favouring the doctrine, and circulated among the bishops, of whom four hundred and fifty signed it. A counter-petition was also drafted and signed by about one hundred bishops, asking that the question of Infallibility be not laid before the Council, on the ground that to define it would be both unwise and unseasonable, not that they disbelieved the doctrine itself.[3] The petition of the Infallibilists was accepted by the Commission on the 9th of February, and approved by Pius IX., and accordingly a third chapter, entitled "*Romanum Pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse* was inserted between Chapters XI. and XII. of the original *Schema*.[4] This part of the Schema, as amended, was distributed to the Fathers on the 6th of March. They were requested to hand in their papers on the subject at the close of ten days, but this period proving too short, was extended eight days longer. By the 25th of March one hundred and forty-nine papers had been handed in, representing the views of above two hundred Fathers, some of the documents bearing the signatures of more than twenty bishops. The Commission on Faith made an *Analytical Synopsis* (*synopsis analytica*) of all these papers, which, when printed, filled two volumes, one of 144 pages, 4to, on the Primacy, and another of 242 pages, 4to, on the *Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*. From this it is clear that the Commission on Faith did not fail of its duty.

In the meantime the Schema on Catholic Doctrine had been recast by the Commission on Faith, and was distributed to the Council on the 14th of March. Instead of eighteen, it now consisted of only four chapters, with an Introduction or *Proœmium*. In the Introduction the errors are enumerated that have sprung up in the world for the last three hundred years, thus logically connecting the Council of the Vatican with that of Trent. Of the four chapters the first treats *Of God, the Creator of all Things;* the second, *Of Revelation;* third, *Of Faith;* and the fourth, *Of Faith and Reason.* To these were added *eighteen Canons.*

The second discussion on this Schema, as remodelled, began on the 18th of March. Nine Fathers spoke on the Schema *as a whole*, when, no one desiring to speak further, the general discussion was closed, and the special discussion on the chapters, *one by one*, opened. Twenty-one[5] spoke on the *First Chapter;* twenty on the *Second;* twenty-two

---

[1] See the Decree of February 22nd. (Tr.)

[2] Part I., embracing chapters I. to X., treated of *The Church of Christ;* Part II., embracing chapters XI. and XII., treated of *The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his Temporal Power;* Part III., embracing chapters XIII. to XV., treated of *The Relation of the Church to the State.*

[3] Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 98 and 113-115. (Tr.)

[4] For the reasons brought forward for and against *the defining* of infallibility, see Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 101-121. (Tr.)

[5] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 93, says *sixteen*. (Tr.)

on the *Third;* and twelve on the *Fourth*. The *Proœmium*, after having been twice amended, was finally *unanimously* adopted in a General Congregation held March 29th. The First Chapter, after revision and amendment, was passed April 1st; the Second, April 8th; and the Third and Fourth, April 12th. The *Schema*, as a whole, was then proposed for acceptance. No one voted *Non placet*, but eighty-three voted *Placet juxta modum*. Their amendments were sent to the Commission, printed in a quarto volume of fifty-one pages, and distributed. Finally the *Schema*, as amended, was adopted by an unanimous vote on the 19th of April.[1] In the THIRD PUBLIC SESSION, held on Dominica in Albis, or Low Sunday, April 24, the *Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith* was accepted by the *unanimous* vote of six hundred and sixty-nine Fathers.[2] On the following day the *Schema on the Little Catechism*, as revised by the Commission on Discipline, was distributed to the Council, and discussed in two General Congregations, held on the 29th and 30th of April. It was once more sent back to the Commission, with the amendments; but though it again came before the General Congregation on 4th and 13th of May, no definite result was reached. The *Schema on the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*, as it came back from the Commission on Faith, formed only one part of the original *Schema on the Church of Christ*, and was entitled *First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ*. It consisted of an Introduction and four Chapters: I. Of the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in Blessed Peter; II. Of the Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs; III. On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; IV. Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff. Printed copies of this *Schema*, embodying the amendments of the two hundred bishops, were distributed to the Fathers during the last days of April, and the general discussion opened on the 14th of May, and continued through fourteen sessions, closing on the 3rd of June.

In that interval, sixty-four had spoken, the majority of them on Chapters III. and IV. A hundred others had sent in their names to speak; but as it appeared that all the arguments that could be brought forward had been exhausted; that the speakers were going on repeating themselves; that instead of confining their remarks to the *Schema* as a whole, they had already anticipated the discussion in detail, particularly as regards Chapters III. and IV.; that each of the seven hundred bishops might yet speak five times, that is, once on the Introduction and once on each of the Four Chapters, or, in other words, that there were still a possible three thousand and odd speeches to be listened to, it was necessary, as Cardinal Manning says, that in this, as "in all human affairs, the limits of common sense should be respected at last." As we have seen by the later regulations of the council, any ten Fathers might petition the Presidents to put it to a vote to ascertain whether the discussion was to go on or be closed. The petition to close the general discussion was signed by about one hundred and fifty bishops, put to the council, and carried by an immense majority. Then began the *special discussions* on the Introduction and the Chapters one by one. In the first General Congregation, held June 6th, seven spoke on the Introduction; on the following day, three spoke on Chapter I. and five on Chapter II. The discussion on Chapter III. lasted from the 9th to the 14th of June, and thirty-two spoke. The Introduction and the first three Chapters, with the proposed amendments, were then sent back to the Commission on Faith. In the special discussion on *Chapter IV.*, which lasted through eleven sessions, from the 15th of June to the 4th of July, fifty-seven spoke, among whom were six cardinals aad two patriarchs. The Introduction and the first two Chapters were reported July 5, and adopted nearly unanimously. The discussion on Chapter IV. was opened by Cardinals *Rauscher* and *Matthieu* on the side of the opposition. It would appear that during this discussion, as in the Council of *Trent*,[3] some of the Fathers momentarily forgot themselves and lost their tempers. But as feeling ran high on both sides, and as bishops are after all human, this was in the nature of things. At the close of the discussion, Chapter IV., with ninety-six proposed amendments, was sent back to the Commission on Faith. On the 11th of July the Commission reported, having added three new paragraphs,[4] and substi-

---

[1] "In passing this one Schema, the interval between the 14th of March and the 19th of April was consumed; seventy-nine members of the council spoke: three hundred and sixty-four amendments were made, examined, and voted upon; six reports were made by the Commission upon the text, which, after its first recasting, had been six times amended." Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 95. (TR.)

[2] Acta et Decreta, pp. 170-179; Œcum. Counc., N. IX., pp. 1-29, Lat. and Germ.

[3] See Vol. III., p. 429, *supra*.

[4] Card. *Manning*, L. c., p. 138. (TR.)

tuted for the title *De Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate* the following: *De Romani Pontificis Infallibili Magisterio.* Most of the changes were accepted.

On the 13th of July, Chapters III. and IV. were adopted by a great majority. The whole *Schema on the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff* was again hastily printed and distributed to the Fathers for the final vote on the same day. There were present 601 Fathers, of whom 451 voted *Placet* or *ay;* 88 *Non placet* or *no;* and 62 *Placet juxta modum* or *ay*, with a qualification. The written amendments consequent upon this vote numbered one hundred and sixty-three, which were sent to the Commission, examined, and the report made on the 16th of July. Many of the amendments were adopted by a great majority; among others, two proposed by the Commission, and the following addition to the formula of the definition of Infallibility: "Ideoque Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese '*non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ*' irreformabiles esse."[1]

The whole Schema was again reprinted, distributed, put once more to the vote, and passed.[2] At the close of this General Congregation a protest was read by the Cardinal President against the numerous misrepresentations and falsehoods circulated concerning the council in the newspapers of every tongue and in anonymous pamphlets. Of the latter the Protest instanced two, "written in French and entitled *Ce qui se passe au Concile* and *La dernière heure du concile*, which, for the arts of calumny and the license of detraction bear away the palm from all others." With this protest closed the eighty-fifth General Congregation. A last effort was now made to prevent the promulgation of the doctrine of Infallibility. On the evening of the 15th of July, *Simor*, Primate of Hungary; *Rivet*, Bishop of Dijon; and *Von Kettler*, Bishop of Mentz, had an audience of the Pope, during which, speaking in the name of those whom they represented, they besought him not to promulgate the dogma of Infallibility, or at least to put it off until the *Schema on the Church of Christ* had been more fully discussed. Bishop *Von Kettler*, in the urgency and earnestness of his appeal, cast himself on his knees three times before the Holy Father, but to no purpose. On the following day, Cardinal *Rauscher*, in taking leave of Pius IX., represented in strong language the possible evils that might follow the promulgation of the dogma, to whom the Pope replied: "The affair has gone too far now." On the 17th of July, a memorial, signed by fifty-five bishops, representing France, Austro-Hungary, Germany, and America, was sent to the Pope, to whom it was handed on the morning of the 18th. The memorialists state that, acting on the dictates of their conscience, eighty-eight Fathers voted against the *First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ* at the General Congregation of the 13th of July, sixty-two voted *Placet juxta modum*, and seventy remained away altogether; that since that time their own convictions had been, if possible, strengthened, and they therefore now renewed the votes they then cast; that they purposed to stay away from the *Public Session* to be held on the 18th of July, because their filial love and reverence for the Holy Father would not permit them to say *no* openly and to his face in a matter that so nearly concerned him personally; and that they would therefore at once return and seek peace and quiet among their flocks, which on many accounts were sorely in need of their presence.[3] These bishops knew quite well that it was useless to say that they now repeated their votes of July 13th, for the reason that only the votes of those *actually present* were valid. On Tuesday, the 18th of May, the Fourth Public Session was opened with the usual solemnities, Pius IX. presiding in person. After Mass had been celebrated and the *Veni Creator* sung, the Bishop of Fabriano read from the *Ambo* the text of the First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ, after which the under-secretary of the Council called upon each Father by name to vote. Of the 535 present, 533 voted *Placet*, and 2, one from Sicily and the other from the United States, *Non placet;* and even these subsequently expressed their full submission to the decision of the Council. In this way a

---

[1] The formulary of Infallibility now ran as follows: Sacro approbante concilio docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum pontificem, cum ex cathedra loquitur, i. e., cum omnium christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse.

[2] Card. *Manning*, L, c., pp. 138, 139. (Tr.)

[3] See *Friedrich*, pp. 263, 264; and *Friedberg*, pp. 622, 623.

moral and almost a numerical unanimity of those present was secured, thus carrying out the rule of the Council of Trent, to the effect that "*in plena synodo*" decisions were to be passed "*vel ab omnibus si fieri potest, vel a longe majori parte;*" while, on the other hand, the fact that two voted *nay* proved that the Fathers enjoyed the fullest freedom.

The Pope, then rising, said: "The Decrees and Canons contained in the Constitution just read have been received by all the Fathers, two only excepted; and We, with the approbation of the Council, define both one and the other as read, and confirm them by our apostolic authority."[1]

He then went on to speak as follows: "The authority of the Roman Pontiff, great as it is, Venerable Brethren, does not oppress, but sustains; does not destroy, but builds up; and very frequently strengthens and defends the rights of our Brethren the bishops. Hence, let those who now judge in agitation, bear in mind that the Lord is not in the storm. Let them remember that only a few years ago *they held the opposite opinion*, and abounded in the same belief with us and in that of the greater part of this most august assembly, because then they judged in the spirit of 'gentle air.' . . . We pray God to illuminate their minds and hearts, that all may come to the bosom of their father, the unworthy Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, who loves them and desires to be one with them."[2]

The *Te Deum* was then sung, after which the *Fourth Public Session* of the Vatican Council was closed with Pontifical Benediction. While the voting was going forward, a violent thunderstorm was raging outside, which some interpreted as an articulate voice of divine anger, and others as a heavenly attestation to the truth of the dogma, like unto that which accompanied the promulgation of the Law on Sinai.

On the day of the holding of the Public Session war broke out between France and Prussia, and, as a consequence, Rome was menaced. This event, together with the excessive heat, which was intolerable to many of the bishops, reduced their number to about two hundred. The *General Congregations* were reopened on the 13th of August, and the *Schemata on Vacant Sees* and *on the Life and Manners of the Clergy* distributed. The work of the council was shortly interrupted by political events, which followed each other in rapid succession. During the first days of August the French troops were withdrawn from Roman territory, and on the 20th of September the Piedmontese troops entered Rome. It being now next to impossible for the Fathers to go on with their work, the Holy Father, by the bull *Postquam Dei munere*, dated October 20, 1870, prorogued the council until a more seasonable time.[3]

The day of the promulgation of the decree of the Infallibility of the Pope, July 18, coincided with the day on which France declared war against Prussia. The war was one of extraordinary magnitude, dreadful catastrophes, and alarming consequences, including the capture and dethronement of the Emperor *Napoleon III.*, the destruction of the French army, and the temporary paralysis of France. The design of seizing Rome had been long matured, and Victor Emmanuel, who had been up to this moment restrained by the power of France, now proceeded to carry the design into execution. *After a short, but gallant struggle, the small pontifical army was defeated on the 20th of September*, 1870, *and Rome taken forcible possession of by the troops of the Kingdom of Italy.* No European power came to the aid of the Pope; none offered him protection; and from that day to this he has been a prisoner within the walls and grounds of the Vatican. He is deprived of the freedom and independence necessary to the exercise of the functions of his high office and indispensable to one who is to govern the Church in every country. By the suppression of the monasteries he has been in a great measure deprived of the valuable services of a large body of learned and truly pious Regulars, whose assistance in the various Congregations is so necessary to him in the government of the Church. The *laws* passed by the Italian Parliament *guaranteeing his freedom and independence*, even allowing that there was ever any honest intention of carrying them out, would be utterly inadequate for the purpose in a country where the Government suffers itself to be intimidated by the mob.

Some of the bishops, on returning home to their dioceses, found a few persons here and there dissatisfied with the work of the council, and notably with the decree of Infalli-

---

[1] Acta et Decreta, pp. 181-187; Œcumenical Council, *Voices*, No. 10, pp. 1-17, where the Constitution *Peter Æternus* is given in Latin and German; The Vatican Council, pp. 221-230, in Latin and English.

[2] Acta et Decreta, p. 187; Œcum. Council, No. 10, p. 101.

[3] Acta et Decreta, pp. 190, 191; Œcum. Council, No. 11, pp. 9-12, Latin and German; *Friedberg*, pp. 623, 624.

bility. It has been said that the definitions of the council caused these to fall off from the unity of the Church; but, while the definitions may have been the occasion, they were not the cause. The lives of those who did go out from the Church had been for years a preparation for their final falling off, and the definitions of the council only afforded them a plausible pretext for their action. As well might it be said that the Council of Nice was responsible for the eighty bishops that then fell away from the unity of the Church under a similar pretext, and for the large following that they brought with them; or the Council of Ephesus for the thirty bishops that still clung to the Nestorian heresy; or the Council of Chalcedon for the schism of the Monophysites; or the Council of Trent for driving whole nations over to the Lutheran heresy.[1]

Compared with the multitudes that dropped off from the unity of the mystical vine on the above occasions, those who left the Church after the close of the Vatican Council, or before it, were only a handful, and they separated for precisely the same reason, because they were not of her fold. The same explanation may be given of the policy pursued by governments. They rose simultaneously against the Church, were equally aggressive and malignant, and all assigned the very same pretexts for their action. But again the promulgation of the decree of Infallibility was only the occasion of these attacks. Their hostility was not greater after than it had been before the council, only they had now a plausible argument to justify their conduct before the world.[2]

The bishops who signed the Memorial on the 17th of July, closed by saying that they "*vowed unalterable fidelity and obedience to the Holy Father.*" Accordingly, after their return home, they at once submitted to the decision of the highest authority in the Church, and set an example to their respective flocks by promptly and cheerfully professing the articles of faith as set forth in the decrees and canons of the Vatican Council. In this they but did what had been done by a still larger number of bishops, after a long resistance to the Fifth Œcumenical Council in 553, and by the liberal-minded Cardinal of Lorraine on a like occasion.[3] Even those who had questioned the seasonableness of the definition, including Bishop Dupanloup, and had made *that* the *sole* ground of their opposition, gave up their own opinions after the authoritative decision of the council. In *Germany*, above all other countries, the opposition to the dogma was most marked and pronounced; but the excitement this opposition evoked did not reach its full height until Professor *Von Döllinger*, Provost of the Chapter of Munich, at one time the most zealous and influential defender of the Catholic Church, published his "Reflections for the Bishops of the Council on the Question of Papal Infallibility," October, 1869; his "Analysis of the New Order of Business in the Council," March, 1870; and his "Declaration to the Archbishop of Munich," March 28, 1871. In this last publication he said that neither as a Christian, nor as a theologian, nor as an historian, nor as a citizen, could he accept the dogma of Papal Infallibility. These publications were widely circulated, exercised an immense influence, and brought out numerous expressions of approval and sympathy.[4] In the midst of this agitation and uncertainty the German bishops assembled at Fulda at the end of August, 1870, and published over all their names a common Pastoral Letter, in which they promulgated the Decrees of the Vatican, saying, "these decrees have received a binding power on all the faithful by the fact of their final publication by the Supreme Head of the Church in solemn form at the Public Session."[5]

---

[1] See Card. *Manning*, L. c., pp. 199-202. (Tr.)

For numerous diplomatic documents bearing on this question, see *Friedberg*, L. c., pp. 521-569.

[3] See Vol. I., p. 438 sq.; and Vol. III., p. 437.

[4] From the very beginning the excitement was kept up and intensified by the numerous *letters* published in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* on the Roman Council; in *The Cologne Weekly;* in *The Rhenish Mercury*, specially founded for the occasion in 1869; and in *The German Mercury*, of Munich, since 1872. The letters to the *Augsburg Gazette*, in the composition of which it was not difficult to discover the hand of *Dr. Döllinger*, were republished under a new form at Leipsig in 1869, under the title of "The Pope and the Council," by *Janus;* and in Munich, in 1870, under the title of "Roman Letters on the Council," by *Quirinus.* Bishop *von Kettler* wrote a refutation of them, entitled "The Utterances of the Roman Letters on the Council," in the *Augsburg Univ. Gazette*, Mentz, 1870; and *Hergenröther* another, entitled "Anti-Janus, a Historico-Apologetical Criticism of Janus;" and another, entitled "The Catholic and the Christian State, a Sequel to Anti-Janus," Freiburg, 1872.

[5] Œcumenical Council, No. 12, p. 8. Card. *Manning*, Petri Privilegium, London, 1871; Appendix VII., p. 227. (Tr.)

A special letter was written to the clergy of Eichstädt, in May, 1871, and several bishops wrote pamphlets, fully explaining and defending the Vatican decrees.[1] The drift of these publications, whether of a public or private character, was substantially as follows: 1. That Papal Infallibility does not mean that the Pope is *impeccable;* or that he cannot err as a private teacher; or that he is *inspired* by the Holy Ghost, as were the prophets and apostles; but simply that in the exercise of his office of teacher of the Universal Church, i. e., when solemnly defining and promulgating a revealed truth that must be held by all (*doctrinam—tenendam definierit*), he is directed by a special *divine assistance* (*assistentia divina*) in such way that he cannot fall into error. 2. That the subject-matter upon which the infallible teaching-office of the Roman Pontiff is to be exercised is limited to *faith* and *morals*, as contained in Holy Writ and Tradition; that this infallibility is identical with that claimed and exercised by the primitive Church in her office of teacher; that it resides in the Head of the Church and in the body united with the Head; and that it is exercised *through the Head*, the Bishop of Rome, whose right it has ever been to approve the decrees of Œcumenical Councils. 3. Finally, that therefore the claim to appeal to an Œcumenical Council or to the verdict of the Church dispersed over the world from a papal definition, promulgated *ex cathedra*, cannot be so much as entertained. Many also laid stress upon the necessity of remaining in the unity of the Church, and upon the deplorable consequences of an opposite course. In a Pastoral Letter, published June 16, 1871, *Von Hefele*, Bishop of Rottenburg, used the following words: "While celebrating the Silver Jubilee of our Holy Father Pius the Ninth, we should renew and strengthen our determination never to depart from the centre of unity, and, despite the deplorable events taking place around us, to cling only to the Rock of Peter, firm in the conviction that no danger, whether real or imaginary, that is sought to be avoided by separation, is at all comparable to *the evil of separation itself.*"

It is with sorrow and reluctance, which no motive other than the gravity of our duty as an historian could overcome, that we now go on to relate some of the sad consequences that resulted from turning a deaf ear to warnings and admonitions like that of the Bishop of Rottenburg. Men like *Dr. Döllinger* and *Friedrich*, of Munich, *Reusch*, *Langen*, *Knoodt*, of Bonn; *Reinkens*, of Breslau; and *Michelis*, of Braunsberg, who had stood as priests at the Altar of the Church, and had been among the ablest and most energetic defenders of her doctrines, cut themselves off from her unity by their own act.[2] Since their separation, as they are frequently reminded, they have been maintaining doctrines the contrary of which they zealously professed. They who had been models of conduct, both as men of honour and Christian gentlemen, forget themselves so far as to abuse the sacredness of friendship and to make a public use of what was intended to be strictly private and confidential.[3] Others again, on no authority other than public rumour, revile persons high in public esteem, not sparing the most exalted ecclesiastical dignitaries, and, while heaping contempt and ridicule upon those who joyfully accept the infallibility of the Pope, pertinaciously insist upon their own.[4] Having once been the accomplished champions of the freedom and independence of the Church, they now denounce her as dangerous to the State, and call upon the civil power to resist her pretensions. Although not numerous, they are a compact body, laborious, active, and fiercely energetic; and although before the world so prominently and so long, the world is almost at a loss how to properly designate them. They have been called *Old Catholics* and *Protesting Catholics*, but it would seem that, in view of the fact that their one characteristic note and distinguishing feature is hostility to the Pope, they would be more appropriately called *Neo-Jansenists*. Their just claim to this designation appears to be borne out by facts. At the very beginning of their existence they made advances to the Jansenists, who were drawing out a feeble existence in Holland; they invited the Jansenistic bishops to their Conference at Munich; and in July, 1872, they called Loos, the Jansenistic Archbishop of Utrecht, to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation in the newly-formed congregation in Bavaria. About four hundred children were confirmed on this occasion, and the archbishop, who had passed so many years of his official life in

---

[1] *Bp. Fessler*, The True and the False Infallibility of the Popes, Vienna, 1871; transl. into French; Engl. tr., New York, 1875. *Bp. von Kettler*, The Infallible Teaching-office of the Pope according to the Definition of the Vatican Council, Mentz, 1871. *Bp. Martin*, The True Sense of the Vatican Definition on the Infallible Teaching-office of the Pope, Paderborn, 1871.

[2] For the transactions of the same, with their respective bishops, see *Friedberg*, L. c., pp. 57 sq., 688 sq.

[3] Conf. *Thiel*, My Discussion with the Janus-Christian, Lpsg., 1872.

[4] Foremost and extremest in this course is the *Rhenish Mercury*.

obscurity and inactivity, was not a little flattered to find himself called into public notice by those who, but a few years ago, almost ignored his existence and dismissed his claims with impatient contempt. But fresh honours were still in store for him, and fresh proofs still forthcoming of the con-natural alliance between the dying sect and the one just come into existence. He shortly received another invitation to perform the ceremony of episcopal consecration upon Prof. Reinkens of Breslau; but, after his sudden death, this function was performed by Bishop Heykamp of Deventer, at Rotterdam, August 11, 1873, and a bishopric for the new sect established at Bonn.

Among the apostasies from the Catholic clergy there was not a single bishop; and, besides those already mentioned, only very few *priests*, about forty in all, throughout the whole of Bavaria, the Lower Rhine, Austria, Silesia, and Eastern Prussia. The following of laymen whom these faithless priests carried with them was comparatively small, and not distinguished for either earnestness of devotion or correctness of life. They find little to edify them in the new worship, and will probably soon have cause to regret a step which they took with intemperate haste. Having learned their mistake, they no doubt think it a cruelty that, having rarely frequented the house of God in their previous lives, they must now, to save appearances, and because they have committed themselves, be seen regularly at the conventicles of men.

The conduct of *Dr. Schulte*, formerly Professor of Canon and German Law at the University of Prague, and, since his apostasy, appointed by the Government of Berlin to a professorship at the University of Bonn, is still more insidious and dangerous. All his energies seem to be directed towards making civil governments suspicious of papal infallibility, by impressing upon the minds of statesmen the idea that the world is threatened with a revival of papal supremacy in both the temporal and spiritual orders, notwithstanding the fact that both the bishops and the Pope have repeatedly said that infallible *ex cathedra* utterances are limited to the domain of *faith and morals*. Moreover, the judicial suzerainty exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages had no connection with the doctrine of infallibility. It was the *Jus publicum* of those times, and rested upon the consent of nations and their *compacts* with the Church. Nations then were Christian, and they appealed in the settlement of their quarrels in the last resort to him who was at once the Head of the Church and the recognized Father of Christendom. While the one prerogative is essential to his office, and cannot be affected by any change or political combination whatever, the exercise of the other is accidental, and must necessarily cease when governments and nations cease to be Christian. And, in matter of fact, the only words addressed by *Pius IX.* to the French nation and King William of Prussia, during the late events in which these two countries have been engaged, were words of human sympathy and Christian charity. Hence the Archbishop of Tours, who was the bearer of his message to France, made use of these words: "The Pope does not complain that people no longer make him their judge; he only claims the liberty of weeping over our evils and the right to plead for the lives of his sons."[1] Moreover, the Pope has time and again declared that such apprehensions are entirely unfounded, and that "*the Papacy no longer thinks of reviving the supremacy exercised by it during the Middle Ages.*" Pius IX. even took occasion to bring up this matter in a public audience of July 20, 1871, when he spoke substantially as follows: It has been attempted, he said, to falsify the idea of infallibility, by associating with it the right to depose princes and to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance. This right, he went on to say, was indeed exercised in a few extreme cases, but it has no connection whatever with infallibility. It was a consequence of the *Jus publicum* then in force among Christian nations, which recognized the Holy See as the supreme court of appeal for Christendom, and conceded to the Pope the right to pass judgment upon princes and peoples, as well in temporal as in spiritual affairs. But circumstances are wholly changed now, and it is simply malicious to represent as applicable to the present age a papal prerogative, which was only possible under a very exceptionable state of affairs. There are those who desire me to give a still more precise explanation of the decree of infallibility, but I do not think it necessary, as the decree itself is quite plain and explicit to him who reads it with an unbiassed mind.[2]

In *France*, the congenial home of Gallicanism, there was, contrary to all anticipation, less agitation than in Germany. Inasmuch as the Gallicans have been traditionally averse to any increase of papal power, and to the centralization of ecclesiastical authority in Rome, the acquiescence with which the decree of infallibility was there received was a

---

[1] Cf. *Fessler*, The True and False Infallibility.

[2] Pastoral Papers of the Archdiocese of Munich, July 27, 1871.

surprise to everyone; and the more so because Bishop *Dupanloup*, before setting out for the council, had predicted just the contrary.[1] He did his best to keep the question of infallibility from being brought before the council, and by his letters to *Deschamps*, Archbishop of Malines, on the same subject,[2] was mainly instrumental in having the respected Père *Gratry* write and publish his four *Historico-dogmatical Letters* against papal infallibility. What Père Gratry did for the Archbishop of Malines, at the suggestion of the Bishop of Orléans, *Maret*, Dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris and titular Bishop of Sura, did for *Darboy*, Archbishop of Paris.[3] Still, after the doctrine had been once defined and promulgated, Archbishop Darboy, Bishop Maret, and, shortly before his death, Père Gratry, all submitted to the authority of the council, and accepted its decrees. Finally, Bishop Dupanloup, in a pastoral to his clergy, dated June 29, 1872, in which he *officially* published the Vatican decrees, stated "that although he had opposed the dogma of papal infallibility on the ground that it was *inopportune* to proclaim it, he had never ceased to profess it." He at the same time designated the errors of *pantheism* and *materialism* condemned by the council as the disgrace of the present age and the peril of the future. The only notable names of those of the French clergy who passed over to the Neo-Jansenist party were Père *Hyacinth*, a Carmelite friar; *Michaud*, Chaplain of the Church of Sainte Madeleine; and *Janqua*, an honorary Canon of Bordeaux. The characters of all of them are such that it is a charity to pass them over in silence.

The opposition in *Italy* was led by Conte *Giuseppe Ricciardi*, who attempted the foolish task of holding a counter-council simultaneously with that of the Vatican. By authority of the *Society of Freethinkers* of Milan, this pretentious synod was called to assemble at Naples, where, after holding three sessions, on the 9th, 10th, and 16th of December, it came to an inglorious end, without having accomplished anything.[4] It is but proper to remark, in justice to this august body, that the delegates enjoyed and exercised the fullest freedom of debate, and that, unlike the Fathers of the Vatican Council, they had no tyrannical restrictions placed upon their proceedings. *Père Hyacinth* and the Capuchin, *Fra Andrea d'Altagena*, began an agitation in Rome through the Press and from the pulpit, and as their friends in Germany courted an alliance with the Jansenists in Holland, so did they and their followers seek fellowship with the Waldenses of Piedmont.

It is to be hoped that the Vatican Council may be reopened at no distant day for the solution of questions still in doubt, and to provide against the dangers that still menace the Church and retard the conversion of souls.

§ 414. *Revival of Religion in Different Countries since* 1846—*In Portugal and Spain.*

When the Head of the Church is active and energetic, so are also the members. This is analogous to what takes place in nature, and the pontificate of Pius IX. has been a complete verification of the principle. He has communicated his own zeal to the Church in nearly every country of the world, and the result has been a revival of religious life.[5] In no countries has this revival been less apparent and operative than in *Portugal* and *Spain*, owing chiefly to the civil strife and party conflicts by which these two kingdoms have been agitated.

Portugal has a population of close upon four millions of souls,

[1] Cf. *Lord Acton*, The Vatican Council, Germ. trans., by *Dr. Reisch*, p. 46.

[2] The documents relative to this and other kindred subjects may be found in *Friedberg*, pp. 19-21.

[3] *Père Gratry*, The Bishop of Orléans and the Archbishop of Malines, being four letters (in German, Münster, 1870). See Revue Cath. de Louvain, year 1870, p. 193 sq., art. "De l'Infaillibilité du Pape," by *J. B. Lefebve*. (Tr.) *H. L. C. Maret*, Du Concil général et de la paix religieuse, Paris, 1869, 2 vols.

[4] Cf. *Friedberg*, Collection of Documents, &c., p. 21.

[5] Cf. (*A. Niedermayer*), Review, Conflict and Growth of the Church in Our Day, being a New Year's Greeting, Freibg., 1862. (Here and there rather exuberant). By the *same*, "*Ecclesiastical Review*," in the several numbers of "*The Catholic*" of Mentz.

nearly all of whom are Catholic. It is divided into three ecclesiastical provinces, each having an archbishopric. The Archbishop of *Lisbon* bears the title of *Patriarch*, and the suffragan sees are *Castelbranco*, *Guarda*, *Lamego*, *Leiria* and *Portalegre*, together with the bishoprics of *Angra*, in Terceira, one of the Azores; *Funchal*, in Madeira; *Santiago*, in the most considerable of the Cape Verde Islands; *St. Thomas*, in the island of the same name, and *Angola*, on the Guinea coast, with the bishop's residence at Laonda. The suffragan sees of the Archbishop and Primate of *Braga* are *Aveiro*, *Braganza*, *Miranda*, *Coimbra*, *Oporto*, *Pinhel*, and *Vizeu*. Those of the archbishopric of *Evora* are *Beja*, *Elvas*, and *Faro*. As in other Catholic countries, so also in Portugal, the Crown enjoys the privilege of nominating to vacant sees. Some difficulties, which arose in 1856, concerning the nomination to bishoprics in the East India colonies, were settled by compromise between the Crown of Portugal and the Holy See, but the Portuguese Government steadily opposed all efforts to bring about a concordat.

On the 3rd of July, 1862, *Pius IX.* sent a letter to the bishops of Portugal, in which he pointed out the evils afflicting the Church in that country, earnestly exhorting them to be zealous in the discharge of their duties; to watch carefully over the manners of the clergy; to maintain discipline; to see to it that candidates for the priesthood were well-educated and properly trained; and to allow no works not approved by the Church to be put into the hands of those studying theology. Their attention was also called to the necessity of restoring discipline in the monasteries, of looking after the religious education of the youth, and of instructing the people by word and edifying them by example. In closing his letter, the Pope reproves the bishops of Portugal for not coming to Rome to take part in the solemnities of the canonization of June 8, 1862, and for neglecting to write to apologize for their absence and express their sympathy and approval.

The position of the bishops and clergy of Portugal, it must be said, is one of extreme difficulty. The government being in the hands of the dominant liberal party, is of course hostile to the Church, and takes every opportunity to thwart her interests and to weaken the efficiency of her institutions. In the Roman question its sympathies were with the enemies of the Holy See, and this attitude of hostility has been strengthened and confirmed by the marriage of the young King *Dom Luiz* to a daughter of the late Victor Emmanuel. The most deplorable evil in the Church of Portugal, whether at home or in its dependent colonies, appears to be the urgent *need of priests*, who are not sufficiently numerous to perform even the most necessary ministrations. It is frequently necessary to have laymen administer baptism and to assist at the ceremony of marriage. Convents of men have now wholly disappeared from the land, and the same fate will shortly overtake those of women, from the fact that by a law of 1834 no more candidates are allowed to enter them. Even the Sisters

of Charity, who are mostly French, were brutally driven from Lisbon in 1858, and were forced to ask the protection of France.

The *Catholic* papers published in Portugal are the following: the *Naçao*, at Lisbon, the organ of theLegitimists, whose editor, Eugenio de Locis, sent an address to Pius IX. in October, 1860, to which 58,994 signatures were attached; the *Dirito*, at Oporto; the *Uniao Catholica* (weekly), at Braga; the *Bem Publico* (weekly) and the *Fe Catholica* (bi-monthly) at Lisbon; the *Os Filhos de Maria*, at Oporto; and the *Bibliographia Critica*, a Portuguese enterprise, started by *A. Coetho*, in 1872. As a rule, the editors of these papers make a very successful stand against the hostile liberal Press of the country.[1]

Pius IX. has always taken the liveliest interest in the affairs of *Spain*, and openly professed the warmest sympathy with this eminently Catholic nation. He sent thither a Nuncio in 1847, mainly with a view to filling the vacant episcopal sees. Of course there were difficulties. These were adjusted in Rome in 1848; but the instrument was not ratified by Spain until 1859, after many difficulties had been removed, and was not formally made part of the law of the State until the 4th of April, 1860. It was then accepted as an integral part of the concordat of 1851. By the bull *In celsissima*, of September 26, 1861, the Pope established bishoprics at *Vitoria*, *Madrid*, and *Ciudad Real;* raised *Valladolid* to an archbishopric; and made a new division of the dioceses of Spain. By the new arrangement the ecclesiastical province of *Burgos* has six suffragan sees, *Compostella* five, *Granada* five, *Saragossa* five, *Seville* four, *Tarragona* seven, *Toledo* six, *Valencia* five, and *Valladolid* five. Apart from the bishops there are about 40,000 priests and sixteen millions of Catholics. The parish-priests are appointed by the Crown, the selection in each case to be made from *three* candidates presented by the bishop. In the appointment of bishops the Crown presents three candidates to the Pope, one of whom is chosen to fill the vacant see. Owing to the secularization and confiscation of ecclesiastical property in Spain, this country, like Portugal, has also began to feel the need of priests, there being on an average one parish-priest and two curates to every 10,000 souls. There is also a striking similarity between the policies of the two countries in their attitude towards the older Religious Orders, the Liberals in both kingdoms being intensely hostile to them. In 1864, there were, however, still existing male *congregations* of Piarists, Lazarists, Oratorians, Recollects, and Jesuits; and of the older Orders, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Discalced Franciscans. The number of virgins consecrated to God is far greater and steadily on the increase, whereas the male religious are rapidly decreasing. In 1861, there were 1,746 male religious in Spain, and in 1864 this number had fallen to 1,258. On the other hand, the number of inclosed nuns in 1867, not including, of course, 2,000 Sisters of Charity, was 15,000. While it cannot be denied that the intellectual culture of the clergy

[1] *Silsa*, Dicionario bibliographico Portuguez, &c., 7 vols., Lisbon, 1858 sq.

has been far below what it should be, and that the religious instruction of the people has been greatly neglected, it must also be admitted, on the other hand, if statistics are to count for anything, that the standard of morality is high among all classes. The Spaniards, too, have at all times being warmly attached to the Pope and loyal to the Holy See. There is a remarkable evidence of this fidelity in the proceedings of the Spanish Congress of the year 1861. When the policy of Count Cavour came up for discussion, *Martinez de la Rosa*, the President of the Congress, and a pronounced Liberal, subjected it to a most searching and caustic criticism, and in a speech of remarkable eloquence, declared himself in favour of the Temporal Power of the Pope.

Since the premature death of the celebrated publicist, *Donoso Cortès*, and *James Balmes*, the great philosopher and apologist, few writers of mark have appeared in Spain. Among the best known are *Fr. Xav. Muñoz*, author of the *Manuale Isagogicum in S. Biblia*, 1868; *Leo Carbonero y Sol;* and the distinguished lady *Böhl de Faber*, who, under the pseudonym of *Fernan Caballero*, published many novels and romances, with a view to revive the religious aspirations and patriotic sentiments of her countrymen. Among the numerous periodicals devoted to the service of the Church the following are worthy of special mention: The *Revue Catholique* and *Diario*, of *Barcelona;* the *Epoca* and *Regeneracion*, of Madrid; the *Union*, of Valencia; and the series of *Catholic Pamphlets*, the first of which was published, in 1848, at Barcelona. The association formed at Barcelona for the publication of this series had issued, in 1864, one hundred and fourteen larger works, eighty smaller ones, and fifty pamphlets. In spite of the numerous pronunciamentos, the frequent revolts, and the many ministerial changes that have of late years taken place in Spain, these publications have done a vast deal of good in stimulating and promoting Catholic life among the people.

The progress of the Church was materially retarded by the revolt of the navy off Cadiz on the 19th of September, 1868, and the consequent overthrow of the hereditary dynasty. In September, 1869, during the regency of Marshal Serrano, the Minister of Justice announced his intention of reducing the number of archbishoprics to five and that of bishoprics to thirty-five. Under the elective King *Amadeus*, son of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, fresh changes were made in the ministry, and in 1872 a civil war broke out, in which *Don Carlos* placed himself at the head of the party opposed to the existing Government. Upon the abdication of King Amadeus, in March, 1873, a Republic was proclaimed, which struggled to maintain itself against both the *Carlists* in the North and the *Intransigentes* in the South,[1] until *Alfonso XII.*, son of Isabella II., having been proclaimed by the army King of Spain (January, 1875), the legitimist pretender, *Don Carlos*, was driven into exile

[1] *Victor Cherbuliez*, l'Espagne politique (1868-1873), Paris, 1874. See Archives of *Catholic Canon Law*, Vol. 28, p. 172, and Vol. 29, p. 30.

§ 415. *In France.*

Cf. Napoleon III. and the Catholic Church in France (*Historico-Political Papers*, 1861, in several nros.) †*Hettinger*, The Ecclesiastical and Social Condition of Paris, Mentz, 1852. (This is a silent refutation of the work of *Alban Stolz*, entitled *Spanish Affairs*, in which the author is unsparing of everything French.)

There is no Catholic country that possesses such a wealth of ecclesiastical establishments and religious congregations as France; nor is there any Catholic country that at all approaches her for the number and importance of the religious enterprises she sets on foot and carries into execution. The political events that took place there in 1848 were not without their influence upon the Church. First of all, the Republic, under the presidency of Louis Napoleon, by a law of March 27, 1850, regulating *Public Instruction*, abolished the monopoly of education enjoyed by the French University, and through the persevering efforts of M. de Falloux and his friend, Count de Montalembert, granted liberty of teaching. Next, when the Republic was overthrown and the Empire set up in its room, December 2, 1852, Louis Napoleon, who became its first emperor, under the title of *Napoleon III.*, without abolishing the *Organic Laws*,[1] allowed the Church a fair field and unrestrained freedom of action. The *Pantheon*, around which cluster so many memories, was restored to its original purpose, and, under the patronage of Ste. Geneviève, became a favourite place of religious worship. His zeal in promoting the interests of the Church was also manifest in the provisions he made for building new churches and restoring those that were going to decay. The Church of St. Clotilde, at Paris, built in the Gothic style, was wholly his work. Among those restored by him were Notre Dame and St. Denys at Paris, and others at Tours, Rheims, Amiens, Chartres, Sens, Poitiers, and in other cities of France. At his suggestion, new bishoprics were established in France and Algiers, and proper religious ministrations provided for the army. But, on the other hand, about the year 1860, his attitude towards the Pope gave rise to grave suspicions, which were shown by subsequent events to have been well founded; for the French army, which had been provided for the Pope's protection in 1849, was virtually withdrawn in 1866. *Louis Veuillot* and others of the *Univers* school, who, together with the great majority of the clergy, had given their unqualified support to the emperor after the *coup d'état* of 1852, began now to take alarm and to give expression to their apprehensions. The Liberal Party, under the lead of Montalembert, Lenormand, Cochin, De Broglie, Foisset, and the other writers on the staff of the *Correspondant* newspaper, had declined from the very outset to give any sort of sanction to what they designated the "successful crime." Poujoulat, Capefigue, Laurentie, Henri de Riancey, and notably *Berryer*, the representatives of the Legitimist Party, were

[1] See p. 130 sq.

still more emphatic and outspoken in their opposition to the new empire.

Amid all these religious and political changes France still continued to be an object of special solicitude to Pius IX. In an allocution, delivered September 11, 1848, he deplored the death of *Denys d'Affre*, Archbishop of Paris, who was killed on the barricades, vainly attempting to prevent the effusion of blood and to restore peace. In a brief, dated March 21, 1853, he praised the French bishops for their zeal in holding provincial councils, restoring the Roman Liturgy in their dioceses, and for their devotion to the Holy See. By the bull *Ubi primum*, of January 5th, he raised the see of *Rennes* to the rank of an archbishopric, with Quimper, Vannes, and St. Brieux as its suffragans. New sees were established at Laval and Réunion, and in 1866, *Algiers* was raised to an archbishopric, having for its suffragans Oran and Constantine. By the accession of Nizza and Savoy to the empire, the archbishopric of Chambéry and its three suffragan sees, together with the exempt see of Nizza, became part of the Church of France, in which there are at present seventeen ecclesiastical provinces and thirty-six millions of Catholics. The bishops as a body are most worthy men, wonderfully energetic, and many of them are gifted with splendid mental endowments and distinguished for their learning, their eloquence, and their firmness of character. Gallicanism, which, during the days of the July Government, showed so many portentous signs of returning life, has become nearly, if not quite extinct. Labouring by the side of the bishops is a body of clergy remarkable for the purity of their lives, the dignity of their manners, and their zeal in saving souls. They are highly esteemed by the people, which is the very best proof that they deserve to be so.

The *Religious* of both sexes zealously at work in France are very numerous. Putting aside the many communities of women, the Benedictines, Dominicans, Jesuits, Capuchins, Carthusians, and Trappists, among the greater Orders, have establishments in the country. The religious *Congregations* of men, to some of which the State has given its approval, are still more numerous. Of these it will be sufficient to name the Lazarists, Sulpicians, and Christian Brothers. In the year 1854, 243,699 pupils attended the schools under the care of the *Brothers of Christian Doctrine*, and 77,600 the schools in charge of other communities of Brothers; and in the interval between 1854 and 1866 the number of their schools had increased 500. In 1860, previously to the annexation of Savoy, there were in France, 2,972 houses of female Religious. Of these the inmates of 553 were entirely devoted to the education of youth; of 302 entirely to the care of the sick; of 2,101 to both these offices combined; and of 16 to contemplation and the perpetual adoration of God in the Blessed Sacrament. Close upon two-thirds of the girls of France are educated by Sisters of various Orders, a fact which will account for the appreciation which is there put upon Christian home life. The *Ladies of the Sacred Heart*, the *Augustinian* and *Ursuline Nuns*, have earned an enviable reputa-

tion as teachers in the higher branches of female education. Much has been done to preserve a high standard of Christian morality among the people by the *Society of St. Vincent de Paul.* This society is under the supervision of a president, resident at Paris, and has affiliated conferences in all the cities of France and in some of the more important towns.[1]

The *Society of St. Francis Regis* has also done an immense deal of good. Its object is to unite those living in concubinage in lawful marriage, to secure them as man and wife their civil and ecclesiastical rights, to legitimate their children, to restore to them those that had been placed in a foundling-house, and, by thus placing them on a proper footing in both Church and State and reconciling them to their families, save them from utter ruin and make them useful members of society. Akin to this is the *Society for the Protection of Unfortunate Young Girls,* whose virtue is exposed to special temptation. To those who live at a distance this society supplies the means to enable them to return to their homes. To reclaim those who have fallen the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd* and of the *Immaculate Conception* spare neither labour nor personal sacrifice.

The various Congregations and Associations, the sole aim of whose members is to give themselves up to works of *Christian charity,* have a special claim on our sympathy and admiration. Foremost among these, everywhere and at all times since their institution, have stood the *Sisters of Charity,* of *St. Charles Borromeo,* and of *St. Vincent de Paul.* These are to be found wherever the sick are to be ministered unto, the sorrowful to be comforted, or the needy to be relieved. In the war of the Crimea, in the wars in Italy, Mexico, and the United States, and in the late Franco-Prussian war, they won the admiration and gratitude of all by their deeds of heroic charity. The Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, established at Nancy, have for nearly a quarter of a century been doing a world of good in ministering to the wants of the poor Germans of Paris.[2] The workhouses for criminals are under the care of the *Brothers of the Holy Ghost;* the *Brothers of St. Gabriel* instruct the deaf and dumb; and abandoned or lost children are sought out and provided for by the *Brothers of St. Joseph.* Blind children are educated by the *Sisters of St. Paul,* nearly all of whom are themselves blind; and the labours of the *Sisters of Nazareth and Bethlehem* extend to the holy places whence they take their names. The special object of the *Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul,* recently founded, is to promote the religious observance of Sundays, but also to take charge of orphan boys. The object of the *Society of the Holy Childhood,* founded by Bishop Janson, of Nancy, is to provide means to rescue children exposed in China, to baptize them, and, in case of death, to bury them as Christians. Baron Conchy founded the *Schools of the Orient,* into which children, lost or abandoned by their parents

[1] See Vol. III., p. 464.

[2] *A. Niedermayer,* The Germans of Paris, Freiburg, 1862.

in Mohammedan countries, are gathered and cared for. In striking contrast with these splendid achievements inspired by faith, with these sublime manifestations of Catholic life, with these magnificent witnesses of the charity of which Paris possesses such a wealth, are the demoralization, the frivolity, the impiety, which one meets with in nearly every walk of life in their most repulsive forms. Whether in good deeds or evil France is equally great. While the Catholic is disposed to look at her fairer and better side, and to describe with pardonable enthusiasm the marvellous creations of the religious zeal and charity of her true sons,[1] tourists and novel-writers, more frivolous than the most frivolous of the French, take a cynical delight in exposing vice and scandal, which they have been at pains to seek out; and, after dressing them up in all the circumstance of detail with a wealth and richness of imagery and a copiousness and beauty of diction worthy a higher theme, they send them forth into the world as the "Mysteries of the Modern Babylon."

But France was not content with having prosperous and beneficent associations within the limits of her own territory. Her great people desired the conversion of idolatrous nations, and for this purpose they gave generously of their blood and treasure. The *Missionary Society of Lyons* collects four millions of francs annually in France alone for the support of the foreign missions, and sends forth of the sons of France more missionaries than do all the other nations of Europe put together.

During the pontificate of Pius IX. great advances have been made in the scientific treatment of religious truths. Among those who have been conspicuous in this field are the learned and eloquent pulpit orators *Bautain*, *Lacordaire*, O.P., and *Ravignan*, S.J., who laboured with a large measure of success to lead the minds of men back to Catholic teaching, and to demonstrate that every high and noble aspiration of the age, whether as regards liberty, or science, or art, or social reforms, or the regeneration of Europe, could be realized and made enduring by and through the Church and in no other way. They were followed in the same line of argument by *Felix*, S.J.; *Minjard;* and the ex-Carmelite, *Hyacinth*. There were also many bishops distinguished for pulpit eloquence, of whom the best known are *Dupanloup*, Bishop of Orléans; *Pie*, Bishop of Poitiers; and *Landriot*, Archbishop of Rheims. Among the other important names in religious literature are those of Abbé *Ségur; Nicolas*,[2] the jurist; *Keller*,[3] a deputy from Alsace; and *Guizot*, the Protestant Minister of Louis Philippe, whose *Méditations chrétiennes* and *l'Eglise et la société chrétienne* exercised a wide and beneficial influence upon the minds of the better classes.

The aim of M. *Renan*, the Oriental scholar, is directly antagonistic to

[1] Cf. *Hettinger*, Letter 10, p. 167 sq.

[2] *Nicolas*, Etudes sur le christianisme.

[3] *Keller*, L'Eglise et les principes de 1789; Church, State, and Liberty (in Germ.), Mentz, 1866.

that of the authors just quoted. In his *Life of Jesus*, his *Apostles*, his *St. Paul*, his *Antichrist*, and his recently published *Gospels*, all being contributions to his *History of the Origins of Christianity*,[1] he has renewed the oft-repeated attempt to strip Christianity of its supernatural character, its founder of his divinity, and the New Testament miracles of their claims to credibility. Many able apologists at once came forward to defend the principles and the facts that form the groundwork of their faith. They were not long in dissipating the illusive charm which the Eastern dreamer had thrown about his sentimental and blasphemous works. The Abbé, now Bishop, *Freppel;* Père *Gratry;* Archbishop *Darboy*, of Paris; Bishop *Meignan*, of Châlons; and *Pressensé*, a Protestant theologian, were among the most eminent of Renan's opponents. In the French Senate, Marshal *Canrobert* stated that he hoped no one of that body would express the slightest sympathy with one who had dared to deny the Divinity of Christ and proclaim himself the uncompromising enemy of the faith of their fathers, which has been at all times the religion of the great bulk of the French people. For himself, he said, he formally protested against so wicked a doctrine.

The necessity of making *philosophical studies* more severely methodical was now generally conceded; and, after the publication of the works of Bautain, Bonald, and Bonnetty, none of which exercised any decisive influence on public thought, Père *Gratry* published his writings on the same subjects.[2] But even he was not entirely successful in separating the theological from the strictly philosophical. One gain, however, had been made: the *Traditionalism* introduced by *Lamennais*, and supported in a modified form by Bautain, Bonnetty, and Père Chastel, S.J., became virtually extinct. In the study of *theology*, many, following the example of *Lacordaire*, took as their author St. Thomas; while others, like *Ginoulliac*, studied still more ancient writers. Great progress was made in the study of moral theology by *Carrière*, the Superior of St. Sulpice; Cardinal *Gousset;* and Father *Gury*, S.J.[3] Taking Liguori for their guide, they broke through the tyranny of Jansenistic rigorism so prevalent in France ever since its origin down almost to our own days. *Bouix*[4] wrote on Canon Law; and *Rohrbacher*, *Blanc*, *Darras*, *Renier*, and others on general Church history. Some excellent monographies, treating of particular periods and persons, ecclesiastical institutions and countries, were written by *Gorini*,[5] *Poujoulat*, *Colombet*, *Rochel*, *Ratisbonne*, *Davin*, *Castan*, *Samon*, *Jager*, *Montalembert*, *Crétineau-Joly*, *Albert de*

[1] See the *Nation* of September 20, 1877. (Tr.)

[2] His philosophical writings are: 1. *On the Knowledge of the Soul;* 2. *On the Knowledge of God;* 3. *On the Knowledge of Man, considered in his Intellectual Endowments.* (Transl. into Germ by Dr. *Phahler*, Ratisbon, 6 vols.)

[3] Vie du Père *J. P. Gury*, Paris and Lyons, 1867. (Tr.)

[4] De principiis juris canonici, Paris, 1852. He has also written tracts, De Episcopo De Capitulis, De Jure Regularium, and other subjects; and Revue des Sciences ecclésiastiques.

[5] Défense de l'église, 4 vols.

Broglie, *Capefigue*, *Prat*, and *Dom Piolin*. In exegetics and the study of the original Hebrew and Greek texts, much was accomplished by Père *de Valroger*[1] and Père *Gratry*,[2] *le Hir*, Professor at St. Sulpice, *J. B. Glaire*,[3] *Bargès*, *Gainet*,[4] and Bishop *Meignan*,[5] the last named being intimately acquainted with the biblical literature of Germany.

To the energy, courage, and indomitable perseverance of the Abbé *Migne*, Catholics are indebted for a complete edition of the works of the Latin Fathers of the Church down to Innocent III. (1215), in 217 vols., quarto; and of the Greek Fathers, down to the sixteenth century, in 162 vols. Although these editions are not quite satisfactory in textual accuracy, they have, nevertheless, been of great service in facilitating the study of ecclesiastical literature.[6] The edition of the works of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, published by the *Gaume Bros.*, after the text of the Benedictine editions, are open to the same objection. It must be added, however, that the *Spicilegium Solesmense* (4 vols.) and the *Jus Græcum* (2 vols.) of the Benedictine, *Dom Pitra*, are of unusual merit, and like praise may be given to other works of the Reformed Congregation of Benedictines, as, for example, *Origines de l'Eglise de Rome* and the *liturgical writings* of *Dom Guéranger*. *Caillau* and *Guillon*, Bishop *Cruice* of Marseilles, Abbé *Freppel*, and *Dr. Nolte*, a German by birth, were all successful and learned patristic students; while *Villemain*, and *Charpentier* contributed by their writings to diffuse a taste for a study of the Fathers of the Church. *Gallia Christiana* and *Histoire littéraire de la France*, works begun in the last century by the Benedictines, and left off in consequence of the Revolution, were again taken up and continued by the members of the same Order in the present century. *Victor Palmé* has published a splendid edition of the Lives of the Saints by the *Bollandists*, more than sixty volumes, folio, having already appeared. A powerful stimulus was given to the study of the Christian Middle Ages by the *Ecole des chartes* and the *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, edited by De Wailly, Delisle, Quicherat, Boutaric, and others.

In *Christian antiquities* much of an important character was accomplished by Raoul-Rochette, Charles and Francis Lenormand, Coc, Greppe, Labus, *Perret*,[7] *Martigny*,[8] and Didron;[9] Texier, Renier, and particularly *Le Blant*, gained eminence in the study of *Christian epigraphics;* and for their histories of architecture, sculpture, and paint-

[1] Introduction aux liveres du N. T.
[2] Commentaires sur St. Matthieu.
[3] Introduction hist. et crit. de l'ancien et nouveau Test.
[4] Histoire de l'ancien et du nouveau Test.
[5] Les prophéties messianiques.
[6] *Migne's* publications are discussed in detail in the art. of *Hergenröther*, in Reusch's Periodical of Theolog. Literat., 1867, Nos. 10 and 13.
[7] Catacombes de Rome, 6 vols, large fol., with many coloured lithographs and facsimiles of Christian inscriptions. (Tr.)
[8] Dictionnaire des antiquitiés chrétiennes.
[9] Annales archéologiques.

ing, Gailhabaud and Cahours, Jesuits, and *De Caumont*, *Rio*,[1] and *Viollet-le-Duc* acquired some celebrity. The last named was a warm advocate of Gothic architecture. Finally, *Lambillotte* laboured earnestly to promote the study of church music.

There are French *periodicals* representing nearly every branch of ecclesiastical science. *Etudes religieuses, historiques et littéraires* was founded by the Jesuit Fathers *Daniel* and *Gagarin*, and, until the close of 1871, edited by *De Buck*, a Belgian, and one of the ablest men in the society. There were also the *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* and the *Correspondant*, the latter under the direction of Count Montalembert († 1870). Of the professedly *political journals*, those most zealous in the Catholic cause are *Le Monde*, founded in 1860; *L'Union*, edited by Laurentie, Henri *De Riancey*, his brother Charles, lately dead, and Poujoulat; the *Journal des villes et Campagnes* and *L'Univers*, which was suppressed in 1860, and superseded by *Le Monde*, but again appeared in 1867, under the editorial management of *Louis Veuillot*, who is also the author of *Les Parfums de Rome;* and the lately suspended *Revue Catholique de l'Alsace*. *Montalembert*, in speaking of the death of Lacordaire, represented his dead friend as believing that both the *Civiltà Cattolica* and *L'Univers* were too mediæval in their tendencies, a charge which it is somewhat difficult to understand.

On the 14th of April, 1872, *Pius IX.* reproved all editors who, in their ardent advocacy of a cause, forgot the laws of charity.

§ 416. *In Belgium and Holland.*

Belgium, which is French in language and character, is also French in its manifestations of religious life. Like France, Begium has a wealth of *charitable associations*, possesses a large number of *religious houses*, and contributes abundantly to the work of the *foreign missions*. In 1829, there were in the country 280 houses of Religious; in 1846, the number had increased to 779, and since then it has been considerably augmented. As in France, so also in Belgium, there exists, side by side with the most cheering evidences of a healthy religious life, indubitable signs of a *corruption* as deep and repulsive as it could well be. These are visible in the license of the Press; in an intemperate hostility to the Catholic Church, to priests and to religious; and in an avowed purpose to overturn the Church and clear the country of the last remnant of Christianity. Such was the diabolical spirit that actuated the so-called *Liberals*, the four thousand *Freemasons*, and the sect of the *Solidaires*, when they pledged themselves as a body and individually not to call a priest to their bedside when dying, nor to permit one to be called to any of their associates. In a *congress held at Liége*, in 1866, mainly composed of students, they professed the grossest atheism, naturalism, and communism. These professions were so alarming that the French Government thought it

[1] De l'Art chrètien.

worth while to take measures against such of its subjects as participated in the congress.

In 1857, on the occasion of the passage of the *law relative to charitable institutions*,[1] the mob, incited by the attacks of the liberal Press, committed deeds of scandalous violence against churches and the houses of Religious. These excesses were again on the point of breaking out in 1864, after the notorious *De Buck lawsuit*,[2] but were prevented by the decision and energy of the magistracy. At a time when every other class of citizens were coerced on account of their religion, the Freemasons enjoyed the fullest liberty, and might hold public meetings and march in procession through the streets without hindrance. As is usual, however, the *Jesuits* were the first to feel the effects of these revolutionary outbreaks. In the twelve colleges under their charge they were educating two thousand young men belonging to the better families of the country. This it was that gave offence at the Lodges, whose aim is "*to destroy Catholicity and to extinguish the very idea of Christianity*," and whose members are under oath "*to pursue kings and religious charlatans* with a never-ending hatred, as the pests of society and the world." But Belgium is not wholly composed of enemies of the Church and disturbers of the public peace; her population is essentially conservative and religious. Their faith is kept strong and vigorous, and their good works are directed and encouraged by an exemplary and active priesthood and by a prosperous regular clergy of exceptional zeal. Here as elsewhere the pious and noble congregations of women are numerous and flourishing. In the Chambers the Catholic party is fully the equal of the Liberal party in both numbers and ability; and a well-organized Catholic Press, of exceptional energy and talent, opposes successfully the assaults of the licentious Press of the Liberals. Among the ablest conducted journals on the Catholic side are the *Journal de Bruxelles*, the *Journal d'Anvers*, the *Patrie* of Bruges, the *Bien public* of Ghent, the *Moniteur* of Louvain, *L'Ami de l'Ordre* of Namur, *Le Courrier de la Sambre*, *L'Union de Charleroy*, *Le Nouvelliste de Verviers*, &c.

The *University of Louvain* holds the first place among the *Catholic educational establishments* of Belgium. Its history has been one of uninterrupted success. When opened, in 1835, it had an attendance of eighty-six students. This number has been increasing under the successive rectors—*De Ram*, who died in 1865; *Laforêt*, who died in 1871; and *Namèche*, the present incumbent—the total number attending all the "faculties" being now about eight hundred. Its course of scientific studies is published annually in the University report,[3] and the best productions of its professors are given to the world in the *Revue Catholique de Louvain*.

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Gazette, year 1857, nros. 5. and 6.

[2] The De Buck Lawsuit at Brussels before the Tribunal of Truth, 2nd ed., Freiburg, 1865.

[3] *L'annuaire de l'université catholique* contains, besides a *schema* of the course of studies statistics concerning professors and students, promotions made, obituaries of deceased members of the Faculties, &c

A fresh impulse was given to religious life in Belgium by the *Catholic Congress* of Malines, first held in 1863. There were about 4,000 persons present, representing every class of society and various nationalities. There were representatives there from France and Spain, from Portugal and England, and from Germany and the United States.[1] Although primarily intended to be a Congress of laymen, many priests and bishops participated in the proceedings, to which a special significance was given by the able speeches of Bishop *Dupanloup*, Cardinal *Wiseman*, and Count *Montalembert*, on *religious liberty*. Science, art, charities, and popular education were discussed in special *Committees;* but the subject of the "*daily Press*," which has become one of such vital importance to Catholics, excited more interest and claimed a larger share of attention than any other question. These Congresses, if continued, will tend to organize the Catholics of Belgium, and will enable them to provide against threatened dangers in both Church and State.

The progress of Catholicity in *Holland*, though more silent, is not less real and solid than in Belgium. The *restoration of the hierarchy*, in 1853, by *Pius IX.*, in spite of the remonstrances and indignant protests of the Calvinists and Jansenists, put fresh life and vigour into the Church and Catholics of that country. The opposition to this measure was so bitter and persistent that the Government instructed its ambassador at Rome to use his influence to have the act revoked. The Catholics had now an archiepiscopal see at *Utrecht*, the very citadel of Jansenism, the suffragan sees being *Haarlem*, *Herzogenbosch*, *Breda*, and *Roermonde*. By the Constitution of 1848, *liberty of conscience* was granted to the people of Holland, and this measure was shortly followed by the enactment of a liberal *school-law*. Of course the Catholics made the best of the advantages thus placed within their reach by at once establishing schools and giving them in charge to Religious Orders, whose number was now increased. The Bishop of Roermonde, besides his clerical seminary at *Rolduc*, established a seminary for young men intended for the scholastic profession, in which he provided for the education of thirty students. The Religious Orders, which re-entered the country only in 1830, possessed, in 1862, thirty-eight convents of men, including the houses of the Jesuits, and one hundred and thirty-seven of women. Of the latter the Ursulines of Tildonk, in Belgium, and the Sisters of Charity of Tilburg devote themselves chiefly to the education of young ladies. The Protestants naturally took alarm at the growth of Catholicity, once it had been given a fair field, and made a futile attempt to have a law passed making education at once free and compulsory. As it was, the Government inspectors of schools, who were mainly Protestant, gave no little annoyance to Catholics in the matter of education, and never missed an opportunity to place obstacles in the way of their

[1] *A. Niedermayer*, Malines and Würzburg, being Sketches and Pen Pictures made in the Catholic Congresses of Belgium and Germany, Freiburg, 1865.

advance. But the bishops and clergy, both secular and regular, were active and vigilant, and rarely failed to baffle these attempts. The Catholics, too, fully appreciated the advantages of the Press; it gave them an opportunity of setting themselves right before the *public*. Books, magazines, newspapers, and almanacs, treating of current subjects, and written in a popular style, began to pour from the printing-press, and grew in number as days went on. In theological literature the Dutch also produced some works of merit, as, for example, the *Moral Theology* of *Van de Velde*, and the *Canon Law* of Professor *Van de Burgt*, of Utrecht. Professor *Broere*, the poet and pulpit orator; Dr. *Nuyens*, Professor *Wensing* and *Alberdingk Thijm*, were also authors of distinction. *Habets* and *Willems* acquired some reputation in the field of ecclesiastical, profane, and art history. *De Catholik*, a periodical edited by the professors of theology at Warmond, largely contributes towards keeping literary life active, while the questions of the hour are ably discussed in several newspapers of Limburg and North Brabant, but chiefly in *De Tyd*, of Amsterdam. The results of these efforts have been cheering and abundantly satisfactory, for of the population of Holland, 3,700,000, close upon one-half, are now within the pale of the *Catholic* Church. Unhappily, the *Jansenist* schism has been perpetuated down to our own day. In the dioceses of *Utrecht* and *Haarlem* there are about 5,000 Jansenists, distributed into twenty-five congregations. The diocese of Deventer is simply a misnomer, as it contains not a single schismatic congregation. The bishops of these sees have all been excommunicated by Rome. If the aid contributed by France towards the maintenance of the Jansenistic seminary at Utrecht were cut off, both it and the schism it perpetuates would soon cease to exist. In 1856, the bishops of the Jansenist Church of Holland protested against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and, in 1874, formally allied themselves to the Old Catholics of Germany. In spite of the strenuous efforts of the Freemasons of Belgium to retard the progress of the Church in the Grand Duchy of *Luxemburg*, a dependency of Holland, the evidences of reviving life and activity are encouraging and substantial. An episcopal see was established at Luxemburg, June 17, 1870, and facilities afforded by the opening of a *greater Seminary* at the same place for the study of theology, archæology, and church music. Catholic interests find able advocates in *La voix de Luxembourg* and other journals of nearly if not quite equal merit.

§ 417. *In Great Britain and Ireland.*

Dr. Moufang, Card. Wiseman and the Services he rendered to Science and the Church, two lectures, Mentz, 1865. *Dr. Newman, Apologia pro vita sua*, being a Reply to a Pamphlet entitled "What, then, does Dr. Newman Mean?" (translated into German by the Rev. *Schündelen*, Cologne, 1865.)

The prophetic words uttered by the sagacious *Bossuet*, at a time when Anglicans entertained only feelings of intense hatred and malignant hostility towards the Catholic Church, are being verified in

our own day. Speaking of the English people, he said: "*A nation so wise cannot long remain deluded. Its professed reverence for the Fathers and its deep and patient study of antiquity will lead it back to the teaching of the primitive ages.*"[1] Dr. Newman also refers in his *Apologia* to "'a much venerated clergyman of the last generation,' who said, shortly before his death, '*Depend on it, the day will come when those great doctrines, now buried, will be brought out to the light of day, and then the effect will be fearful.*'"[2]

Nicholas Wiseman and *John Henry Newman* have done more than any other men of the present century to start the movement towards the Catholic Church in England. The religious agitation in England, known as *Puseyism* or the *Tractarian Movement*,[3] which seemed called forth by the Spirit, who breatheth where he will, counted among its promoters clergymen scattered all over the country, and representing almost every shade of social and intellectual life. Speaking of the antecedents of those identified with the movement, Dr. Newman says:

"Dr. Hook and Mr. Churton represented the High Church dignitaries of the last century; Mr. Perceval, the Tory aristocracy; Mr. Keble came from a country parsonage; Mr. Palmer from Ireland; Dr. Pusey from the Universities of Germany, and the Study of Arabic MSS.; Mr. Dodsworth from the study of Prophecy; Mr. Oakley had gained his views, as he himself expressed it, 'partly by study, partly by reflection, partly by conversation with one or two friends, inquirers like himself;' while I speak of myself as being 'much indebted to the friendship of Archbishop Whately.' And thus I am led on to ask," he continues, "'What head of a sect is there? What march of opinions can be traced from mind among preachers such as these? They are one and all, in their degree, the organs of one sentiment, which has risen simultaneously in many places very mysteriously.'"[4]

This movement, simultaneously set on foot in so many quarters of the kingdom by men of antecedents so various, finally centred in Oxford. From this point its leaders began to propagate their doctrines. Taking the Thirty-nine Articles as a basis, they applied themselves to the study of the Fathers with an eagerness that amounted to enthusiasm, in the hope of removing the vagueness of doctrine and correcting the laxity of discipline, which they felt to be blots upon the Anglican Church. *Justification* and the *Eucharist* were the first subjects to which they turned their thoughts. The fruits of these labours were the *Tracts for the Times*, of which, as Dr. Newman says, he was "the editor and mainly the author."[5] The first of these was issued in 1833. *Apostolic succession* is insisted on as the only mark of the presence of the Holy Ghost; and *ecclesiastical tradition* is set forth as a necessary complement to Scripture in determin-

[1] *Bossuet*, Histoire des variations des églises protestantes, liv. VII., c. 114.

[2] *Apologia*, &c., New York, 1865, p. 140. (Tr.)

[3] See a full account of the Movement in the *Apologia* of Dr. Newman, Part IV. Dr. Newman began the Tracts, as he says, "out of his own head," and hence the name *Tractarianism*, which was changed to Puseyism after Dr. Pusey joined the Movement, because he became its leader, having qualifications for that office which Newman did not possess. (Tr.)

[4] *Apologia*, &c., pp. 140, 141. (Tr.)

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 88. (Tr.)

ing precisely and adequately what belongs to the body of Catholic truth. As has been said, the authors of the Movement took the Thirty-nine Articles as the groundwork of their position. They hoped to find them sufficiently elastic to be able to touch the Anglican Church with one extreme of them, and the Catholic, or, as they said, Church of Rome, with the other. In other words, they wished to effect a compromise between the Roman and the Anglican doctrines by principles such as are indicated by the name *Via Media*, which they chose to characterize the drift of the Movement. It was found, however, that this line of argument was impossible, and after the publication of Tract 90, in 1841, it had to be given up. In this Tract the author, *Dr. Newman*, endeavoured to prove that the Established Church of England is a branch of the great Catholic Church, and that the Thirty-nine Articles may be harmonized with the Decrees of Trent.[1] About this time the Anglican bishops opposed the publication of the Tracts, and they were in consequence discontinued. Owing to the intellectual difficulties he felt at not being allowed to put his own sense upon the Articles, Dr. Newman "intended to gradually fall back into Lay Communion," and with this thought before his mind, resigned his parish of St. Mary's, Oxford, in the autumn of 1843, and withdrew into private life at Littlemore. To put an end to what he calls his "vague misgivings" at this period, he "determined to write an *Essay on Doctrinal Development*,"[2] which he commenced in the beginning of 1845, and continued working at through the summer. "As I advanced," he says, "my views so cleared that instead of speaking any more of 'the Roman Catholics,' I boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end, I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished."[3] He was received into the Roman Catholic Church, October 8, 1845, by Father Dominic, a Passionist. His example was followed by large numbers of the Anglican clergy and of the aristocracy. In 1867, the number of distinguished converts to the Catholic Church in England amounted to 867, of whom 243 had been Anglican ministers. Although *Dr. Pusey* publicly defended the ground taken by Dr. Newman in Tract 90, he has not followed his example in entering the Church of Rome. He clung to the old line of argument, and seemed unable to shake off its contradictory principles. He claimed that it was quite possible to be a Catholic at heart, while one was seemingly a Protestant; and added that the Anglican Church ought to sever all connection with Protestantism, and that, when she had done so, her children ought not to leave her. The Anglican Church was not for him, as for Dr. Newman, a way leading up to the Church of Rome.[4] "Soon," says

[1] "It is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church, and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit. We have no duty towards their framers." *Apologia*, p. 172. (Tr.)

[2] *Apologia*, p. 257. (Tr.)

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 261. (Tr.)

[4] "The Church of England has been the instrument of Providence in conferring great benefits on me; had I been born in Dissent, perhaps I should never have been baptized;

Dr. Newman, "Dr. Wiseman, in whose Vicariate Oxford lay, called me to Oscott, and I went there with others; afterwards he sent me to Rome, and finally placed me in Birmingham."[1]

In 1847, Dr. Newman became a Father of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and began to labour for the Church in England with the spirit and zeal of his patron. In 1850, he organized the *Catholic University* of Dublin, and continued its Rector for five years. He then returned to the House of the Oratory at Birmingham, in connection with which he started a school of higher studies, in which many of the Roman Catholic young men of England have been educated.

Cardinal (then Dr.) *Wiseman* took a lively interest and an active part in the Movement in England towards the Catholic Church. This eminent man was born at Seville, in Spain, of Irish Catholic parents, August 2, 1802. He spent his early years in Ireland, and received his first education at Waterford, whence he passed over to England, spending some time at the College of St. Cuthbert, Ushaw, near Durham. Feeling himself called to the ministry, he, with five other young men, set out for Rome (1818), where he entered the *English College*, just then opened, after having been closed for nearly a generation. Here he remained twenty-two years, laying up that vast store of knowledge, of which, while there, and after his return to England, he turned to such excellent account. His vigorous apologetical and polemical writings, so replete with the gentle and winning grace which charity gives, did a vast deal of good in England. Many of these were published while he was still Rector of the English College at Rome. He returned to England in 1836 to take part in the Tractarian Movement. He subsequently said he "had been surprised, on visiting England in 1835, to find how little attention it had yet excited among Catholics."[2] In 1836, he, together with *Mr. Quin* and *Daniel O'Connell*, commenced the publication of the *Dublin Review*, the aim and scope of which were thus stated by Dr. Wiseman:—

"To watch its (the Oxford Movement's) progress; to observe its phases; to influence, if possible, its direction; to move it gently towards complete attainment of its unconscious aims; and, moreover, to protest against its errors; to warn against its dangers; to provide arguments against its new mode of attack; and to keep lifted up the mask of beauty under which it had, in sincerity, covered the ghastly and soulless features of Protestantism;—these were the duties which the new *Review* undertook to perform, or which, in no small degree, it was expressly created to discharge."[3]

The first number appeared in May, 1836.

His *Lectures on the Connection of Science and Revealed Religion*

had I been born an English Presbyterian, perhaps I should never have known our Lord's divinity; had I not come to Oxford, perhaps I should never have heard of the visible Church, or of tradition, or other Catholic doctrines. And as I have received so much good from the Anglican Establishment itself, can I have the heart, or rather the want of charity, considering that it does for so many others what it has done for me, to wish to see it overthrown?" *Apologia*, p. 322. (Tr.)

[1] *Apologia*, p. 262. (Tr.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, Miscellanies, &c., New York, 1877, p. 153. (Tr.)

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 153. (Tr.)

were published this same year, and also his *Lectures on the Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, both of which were well received, and exercised a wide and powerful influence.

In 1840, Dr. Wiseman was appointed Coadjutor Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District of England, with the title of Bishop of *Melipotamus in partibus infidelium*, and, at the same time, was named President of *St. Mary's College of Oscott*, near Birmingham, where he took up his residence. This was then the great seat of Catholic learning in England, and his appointment to so important a charge was hailed with joy by many, who had received the better part of their education under his guidance. One of the works in which he laboured most earnestly was to bring the Catholics of England to understand that in believing the teachings of the Church and keeping the Commandments, they were only doing part of their duty; they must also adopt her practices, fall in with her customs, and be in full sympathy with her spirit. These thoughts were brought out with striking force and vigour in a Pastoral he published in 1849.

As has been remarked in a preceding paragraph, Gregory XVI., on the 11th of May, 1840, increased the number of districts from four to eight; and Pius IX., by the bull *Universalis Ecclesiæ*, of September 29, 1850, restored the *hierarchy* to England. It consisted of twelve bishoprics and the archbishopric of Westminster,[1] to which Dr. Wiseman was appointed, and was at the same time created cardinal. This measure revived the old hatred of Catholics, and evoked a storm of religious excitement. Catholics were sneered at and insulted; assailed with sarcasm and raillery; made the objects of bold and reckless denunciation; dealt with unfairly in the courts of justice, and misrepresented in the pulpits of the Establishment and Dissent; pertinaciously reviled in the newspapers, and violently declaimed against by popular speakers. The cry of "*No Popery*" went up from one end of the kingdom to the other, and mobs were gathered together by the magic of its sound. At the opening of Parliament, in the year 1851, Lord John Russell introduced the *Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill*, by which anyone not entitled by law to do so was forbidden to assume or use the name, style, or title of archbishop, bishop, or dean of "any place in the United Kingdom." By the *Class and Convent Bill*, priests and religious were prohibited to appear in public in the dress of their Order, and provision was made for an investigation of convents, to ascertain if any of the inmates were there against their will. It was at this time that Cardinal Wiseman, acting with the firmness and dignity so characteristic of apostolic men, published his celebrated address to Englishmen, entitled *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the People of England on the*

[1] The ecclesiastical province consists of the Metropolitan See of Westminster, with the suffragan sees of Beverly, Birmingham, Clifton, Hexham and Newcastle, Liverpool, Menevia and Newport, Northampton, Nottingham, Plymouth, Salford, Shrewsbury and Southwark. Total of priests in England and Wales (in 1878), 1,828; of churches, chapels, and stations, 1,076. (Tr.)

Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy,[1] and announced his intention of delivering a course of controversial lectures at his cathedral. This firmness is all the more admirable from the fact that at this very time Mr. Reynolds declared in Parliament that "the Anti-Popery agitation has risen to such a height throughout the country that he was astonished the cardinal had not been burned in person instead of in effigy." But the cardinal held his ground, and was not only victorious in the long run, but even extorted the admiration of his countrymen.[2] Conversions became frequent; and in 1851, thirty-three Anglican ministers came into the Church, among whom was *Manning*, then one of the most eminent of the Anglican clergy, and *Henry* and *Robert Wilberforce*, brothers of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. The concordat made about this time between Austria and the Holy See was the occasion of another burst of popular fury, which the cardinal succeeded in calming by a second course of lectures on concordats.[3] He held the first *provincial council* at Oscott in 1852, with a view to give to his province a thoroughly ecclesiastical organization. Two others were subsequently held by him at the same place. His numerous lectures, delivered before large and cultivated audiences, on almost every variety of subject—*On Religion and Science; On the Points of Contact between Science and Art*;[4] *On the Connection between the Arts of Design and those of Production; On the Influence of Words on Thought and Civilization; On the Ceremonies of Holy Week; On the Real Presence; On the Doctrines of the Church;* together with his essays and other writings, but particularly his *Fabiola; or, a Church of the Catacombs*, that singularly truthful and vivid picture of the trials and persecutions of the Church in the early ages, gave him a reputation both at home and abroad of being one of the most finished and scholarly writers of his age. The *Callista* of Dr. Newman is a work similar in character to the Fabiola of Cardinal Wiseman, the author's aim being to give a picture of the Church in Africa during the latter days of the persecutions. These two works, the first of a new school, were shortly followed by others, illustrative of Catholic life in the different ages of the Church, and very effective in breaking down a host of prejudices against her institutions and the persons identified with her interests and history. Of the writers who gained distinction

[1] Translated into Germ., Ratisbon, 1851. Cf. *Buss*, Hist. of the Persecution of the Cath. Church in England, 1851.

[2] The restoration of the hierarchy was deprecated at that time by many who confidently asserted that the measure would indefinitely retard the growth of the Church in England. That such has not been the case, but that the reverse has taken place, is shown by Cardinal Manning by the following figures:—

	Churches.	*Priests.*
1830	410	—
1840	457	542
1850	587	788
1862	824	1,215

Miscellanies, p. 42. (Tr.)

[3] Four Lectures on Concordats, Germ., Cologne, 1856.

[4] Germ. by *Reusch*, Cologne, 1863.

in this new field, *Spencer Northcote* (*The Roman Catacombs*), *Maguire* (*Rome and its Ruler*), and *Lady Fullerton*, deserve mention.[1]

Father *Faber*,[2] formerly Superior of the Oratory in London, and his Brothers of the Oratory, together with some laymen, whom they associated with themselves in the work, edited and published a series of ascetical writings, which were well received, and did a great deal of good in other countries as well as in England († 1863). In a magnificent speech, made at the Second Congress of Malines, Cardinal Wiseman spoke with gratitude and exultation of the progress of the *Catholic Church in England*, the result of the combined labours of men who were single-minded and in earnest in their work. The whole life of the great cardinal was a verification of the words uttered by him on his death-bed. "*I have always*," said he, "*allowed others to do as much good as they would; I have never stood in the way of anyone; and God has blessed my manner of acting.*" He referred here to the *Tablet*, a weekly newspaper, the first number of which appeared May 16, 1840. It was edited for fifteen years by Mr. *Frederic Lucas*, a convert from Quakerism, and one of the most accomplished and scholarly writers of England. The tone of the paper was then, and has continued to be so since, independent, though thoroughly loyal to the Church and the Holy See. It permits in its columns the discussion of all questions on which a difference of opinion is allowed by the Church, never excluding papers because it discovers in their authors' argument a divergence from its own line of thought. It pursued a middle course between the *Dublin Review*, edited by *Dr. Ward*, and the *Home and Foreign Review*, edited by *Lord Acton*, the former of Ultramontane and the latter of liberal tendencies. There are also two other weekly newspapers of high merit published in London, viz., *The Weekly Register* and the *Westminster Gazette*, the latter started in the beginning of 1867. Like the *Tablet*, while giving all needful attention to the current topics of the day, they are chiefly remarkable for the ability with which the relations of Church and State are discussed in their columns; for their discriminating reviews and notices of new books; for their foreign correspondence; and for their temperate and thorough treatment of political and social questions. One of the ablest periodicals of any denomination in England is the *Month and Catholic Review*, conducted by the Jesuits.

By the death of Cardinal Wiseman, which occurred February 15, 1865, the Church lost one of the most active, learned, and worthy

[1] Cf. Collection of the Classical Works of Modern Literature in England; Germ. translation, published at Cologne by Bachem.

[2] His published writings after his conversion are as follows: "Catholic Hymns" and an "Essay on Beatification and Canonization" (1848); "The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri" (1850); "Catholic Home Missions" (1851); "All for Jesus" (1854); "Growth in Holiness" (1856); "The Blessed Sacrament" (1856); "The Creator and the Creature" (1857); "The Foot of the Cross; or, the Sorrows of Mary;" "Spiritual Conferences" (1859); "Bethlehem;" "The Precious Blood," &c. A complete edition of his ascetical works has been republished (partly from advance sheets) by John Murphy & Co., Baltimore. See Bowden's "Life of F. W. Faber," 1869. (Tr.)

bishops of this century. To an elegant and classic taste he united deep and varied learning, embracing in its range theology and the natural sciences, canon law, history, and archæology. He was, moreover, distinguished for great prudence, for gracious manners and easy address, for dignity and firmness of character, and for those other virtues characteristic of a prelate and prince of the Church.

The late *Ritualistic* Movement, led by Dr. Pusey, and, like the Tractarian Movement, having its centre of operations at Oxford, has inspired a hope that through its influence many may be led into the Catholic Church. The advocates of Ritualism claim that under the actual circumstances, if the religious and social condition of the people is to be improved, the rites, the ceremonies, vestments, and institutions of the primitive Church, which the Protestants of the sixteenth century set aside, must be again adopted. Since the publication by Dr. Pusey of his *Eirenicon*, the tentative efforts to conform the Anglican Ritual to that of the old Church have been still more marked and frequent.[1] Dr. Pusey and the Rev. *Mr. Humble* have both strenuously insisted on *penance* as a true sacrament, implying the obligation of *auricular confession* of sins in detail; and while the latter affirms that this sacrament is the only adequate preventative of infanticide, the former declares that it is a most efficacious means of drawing youth off from vices peculiar to that season of life and making them better members of society. The Ritualists are also ardent advocates of *monastic life*. "The foundations of the entire structure of the Missions of the Roman Catholic Church," says *Dr. Mackenzie Wallcot*, "have been laid by members of *Religious Orders*, who practice self-denial in an heroic degree. In our system everything is left in the hands of the secular clergy, and its utter failure proves conclusively that it needs to be organized anew. The conversion of the whole of Europe by the Monastic Orders shows what can be done by the combined efforts of men united by the most sacred ties." These sentiments were also shared by *Dr. Meadow*, who warmly advocated the policy of placing the hospitals and workhouses in charge of religious communities of women.

Cardinal *Manning*, Cardinal Wiseman's successor in the see of Westminster, has laboured zealously to turn to the best account this movement towards the Catholic Church. He is an ornament to the Church, and one of the most able, hard working, and exemplary of living prelates. Like his predecessor, he is possessed of fine mental endowments, and is an accurate scholar, a deep thinker, and a vigorous and graceful writer; and like him, too, he has fairly compelled the admiration of his countrymen by his honest, manly, and outspoken course. His writings are numerous, the most important being, *The Glories of the Sacred Heart*, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, *The Temporal Power of the*

[1] Cf. The present State of the Movement in the Anglican High Church towards Catholicity, with Important Documents, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1867.

Pope, The Independence of the Holy See, Sin and its Consequences, The Love of Jesus to Penitents, Petri Privilegium, The Fourfold Sovereignty of God (2 vols.), *The Four Great Evils of the Day, Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects* (3 vols.), *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, besides essays, reviews, addresses, and controversial papers, some of which have been recently published in a volume of *Miscellanies*.

IRELAND.

Jacob Neher, Eccl. Geography, 3 vols., Ratisbon, 1865-1868. *Flor. Riess*, S.J., The Modern State and Christian Schools, Freiburg, 1868. *Catholic World*, June, 1869.

According to the statistics given in the *Catholic Almanac* for 1878 (p. 96), there are in Ireland 4 archbishops, 24 bishops,[1] 1,004 priests, 1,721 administrators, curates, chaplains, professors, &c., in colleges and schools; 444 regulars; or a total of 3,172 priests; or including bishops, private chaplains, &c., 3,450. They are a zealous, hard-working, and exemplary body, and are wholly supported by the voluntary but generous contributions of the faithful.[2] A taste for learning is kept alive and encouraged among them by theological conferences, held in each diocese four times a year. As a rule, the several bishops preside in person over these conferences, and by their presence and wise supervision stimulate the clergy to pursue their studies with greater zeal and regularity. There are in each diocese, besides a vicar-general, titular canons, and as early as 1862, there were in Ireland nine chapters canonically established. In filling a vacant see, which, during the interval, is administered by a vicar-capitular, the parish-priests of the diocese in which the vacancy occurs send on three names to the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith at Rome, one of which is, with rare exceptions, selected and approved by the Pope. The Cardinal Protector of the Irish Church, resident in Rome, names the Deans of Chapters; the bishops of the country appoint to all other preferments.

If Ireland is not to-day Protestant in religion, it is certainly not because numerous and gigantic efforts have not been made to induce the people to apostatize from the faith of their fathers. Perhaps the most potent; as well as the most plausible and insidious of these, was the establishment of the System of *National Schools*. Even men usually clear-headed and sagacious in judging of questions and measures affecting the interests of the Catholics of Ireland seemed to have been deceived as to the real character of the National Schools. That the National Schools were really designed to subvert the faith of the Catholic people of Ireland is evident from the words of Dr. Whateley, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, who was one of the first commissioners appointed to serve on the National Board. "The education," said he, "supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church."[3] And to show that this was precisely what he intended the schools to do, and that stealthily and insidiously, he went on to say: "I believe, as I said the other day, that *mixed education* is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battles with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me."[4] The history of the National Schools is an illustration of how Catholics may innocently commit themselves to measures, apparently the most beneficial, and in reality the most perilous. It was shown by testimony laid before Parliament in the year 1825 that the instruction given in Ireland was miserably insufficient, and objectionable on other grounds. It was

---

[1] Exclusive of two bishops with no local jurisdiction in Ireland.

[2] *The Freeman's Journal Church Commission* gave the following statistics as to the revenue of the Catholic Church in Ireland in 1868:—

Income of the Bishops and the Parochial Clergy	£340,480
Regular Clergy	55,000
Maintenance, Repairs, and Extensions of Churches	116,550
Hospitals, Orphanages, Asylums, Colleges, Seminaries, Schools, &c. ...	250,000
Total,	£762,030

[3] *Life of Dr. Whatley*, p. 244. (Tr.)

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 246. (Tr.)

therefore proposed to establish a National System of Education, which should be acceptable to persons of all religious professions. The plan was submitted, in 1826, to the Roman Catholic bishops, who refused to give it their approval unless the faith of the Roman Catholic children were fully protected. As a guarantee of this they required that Catholic teachers should be appointed in all schools in which the Catholic children were in the majority; that in schools in which they were in a minority a Catholic assistant should be employed; that Catholic masters and mistresses should themselves have been educated in Catholic schools; and that the school-books used should be approved by the Catholic prelates.[1] In 1828, the Committee of the House of Commons expressed themselves in favour of non-sectarian education in Ireland, and in 1831, Mr. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, in a letter written to the Duke of Leinster, stated that the Government was about to create a Board, of which his Grace was to be President, to superintend a system of National Education. In this letter Mr Stanley drew out the main features of the system. He stated that the Board must not permit the reading of Scripture by all classes of pupils; that the clergy of all denominations were to be treated with perfect equality; and that they were to be free to give religious instruction to the children of their respective creeds. This letter, when made public, roused the indignation of Protestants of all shades of opinion. At a public meeting, held in the Rotunda of Dublin, in 1832, they protested against the exclusion of the Bible from the schools, and the Anglican bishops cried out with equal energy against having the superintendence of National Education taken out of their hands and vested in a Board composed of men of various and conflicting religious opinions. They soon, however, became not only reconciled to the system, but its most ardent admirers and energetic supporters. The leading denominations of Ireland had representatives on the Board. Archbishop Murray of Dublin, represented the Catholics; Dr. Whately, the Anglicans; and Rev. James Carlisle, the Presbyterians. As years went on the number of commissioners increased, until it finally reached twenty, half of whom were Catholics and half Protestants.

In 1850, Dr. *Cullen* was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, and shortly after a bull was published convoking a *National Synod*, to meet at *Thurles*. This was one of the most important events of this century in the history of the Church in Ireland. Its decrees are numerous and important, and refer chiefly to the manners of the clergy, to ecclesiastical discipline and worship, and the administration of the Sacraments, insisting particularly on the correction of abuses, and the restoration of such needful and laudable observances as had fallen into disuse.[2] The bishops disapproved, without directly condemning the National Schools; and demanded that all books used in them, containing anything contrary to Catholic teaching, should be thrown out, and that books used in schools frequented by Catholic children should have the approval of the bishops.[3] The Queen's Colleges, opened for the entrance of students in 1849, were conducted on precisely the same principles as the National Schools. At the instance of *John McHale*, Archbishop of Tuam, who has been since 1825 the determined foe of mixed education and the consistent advocate of separate schools, these colleges had been condemned by Rome, October 18, 1848.[4] They were again condemned in unqualified terms by the Synod of Thurles. It was declared improper for bishops to take any part in their management, and priests were forbidden to have any connection with them, either as Professors or Deans of Residences. Catholic young men were warned not to enter them, on account of the danger to which their faith and morals would be exposed.[5] In the meantime, it was left to the discretion of the bishops to act as might seem best in regard to the National Schools.

Finally, at a meeting of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, at Maynooth College, on the 18th of August, 1869, presided over by Archbishop Cullen, who had been transferred to Dublin on the death of Archbishop Murray, in 1852, the system of mixed education, whether *primary*, *intermediate*, or *university*, was condemned "as grievously and intrinsically dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholic youth."[6] At the request

---

[1] See Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy and Laity of Ireland, 1826. (Tr.)

[2] *Decreta Synodi Plenariæ Episcop. Hiberniæ apud Thurles*, Dublin, 1851. (Tr.)

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 56 sq. (Tr.)

[4] The bill creating these colleges was introduced May 9, 1845. (Tr.)

[5] *Decreta Synodi Plen.*, etc., p. 59 sq. (Tr.)

[6] Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, Dublin, 1871. (Tr.)

of the Bishops of Ireland, this condemnation was confirmed by Rome in the same year.[1] The bishops, long desirous of having a place of Higher Education, where Catholic young men might go without peril to their faith and morals, at length, on the 3rd of November, 1854, opened a *Catholic University* in Dublin. They have sent memorials to Government, representing that Catholics cannot be said to possess religious equality as long as they do not enjoy the same rights and privileges as their Protestant fellow-countrymen in the matter of education, and therefore asking that a charter, authorizing the conferring of degrees in the secular branches, be granted to the Catholic University, and a suitable endowment be provided for its support, or that some other arrangement be made by which Catholics may participate in university privileges without compromising their consciences.[2] Up to the present moment the Government has not shown the least disposition to satisfy these just demands, and the bishops have been obliged to shift as best they can. Thanks to the noble generosity of the Catholics of Ireland, and the assistance received from their brethren in other lands, the Catholic University in Dublin, in spite of the injustice of Government in withholding a charter, is in a comparatively flourishing condition.[3]

Besides the College of Maynooth and the Missionary College of All Hallows, there are thirteen other excellent ecclesiastical seminaries in Ireland.[4]

By the disestablishment and disendowment of the English Church in Ireland, through the *Irish Church Act* of 1869, one of the most stupendous grievances with which a people was ever afflicted was removed. This Act was justly characterized by *Mr. Gladstone*, its author, as "the most grave and arduous work of legislation that had ever been laid before the House of Commons," and was one of the boldest and most thorough attempts that had yet been made to partially correct the accumulated wrongs and wicked legislation of three centuries. Not only had the Irish people been despoiled of their churches, abbeys, and convents, and of their ecclesiastical and charitable institutions; but, in addition to all this, they were forced to pay out of their poverty and hard earnings for the support of an alien Church and a detested clergy.

The capitalized value of the ecclesiastical property of Ireland and the additional annual revenue, literally stolen from the Catholic people of that country, represented in money, even after it had been reduced, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, "by the almost unbounded waste of life-tenants and the wisdom or unwisdom of well-intentioned parliaments," the sum of £16,000,000, in the year 1868. After a protracted and exciting debate, the bill to disestablish and disendow the Irish Establishment passed both Houses of Parliament, and received the royal assent, July 26, 1869. It provided that on the 1st day of January, 1871, the Established Church should cease to exist in Ireland, and its archbishops and bishops be disqualified to sit in Parliament; that churches in actual use should be handed over to the representatives of the several congregations, who were technically designated "governing bodies;" that all other properties, interests, &c., should be taken possession of by a Commission, and disposed of or reconveyed after January 1, 1871, as the Act directed; that archbishops, bishops, and others holding benefices or preferments in the Irish Establishment should receive an annuity equal in amount to their ordinary incomes during the term of their natural lives, or while they continued to perform the duties of their several ecclesiastical offices; that the *regium donum* of the Presbyterians should be withdrawn, and that, in addition to a grant of a sum, equal to seventy-five thousand dollars, to their College at Belfast, they should receive in compensation the annual interest on a sum equal to about four millions of dollars; and that the grant to Maynooth College should also be withdrawn, and the interest of a sum equal to less than half

---

[1] The injustice of the system of National Schools in Ireland may be seen from the following statistics:

"1. There are 2,454 schools, containing 373,756 Catholic children, with not a Protestant child."

"2. There are 2,483 schools, having 321,641 Catholic children, with only 24,381 Protestant children."

"That is, in 4,937—nearly 5,000—schools, with 695,397 Catholic children, there are no more than 24,381 Protestant." Card. *Manning*, Miscellanies, Letter to Earl Grey, 1868. (Tr.)

[2] See Resolutions of the Bishops assembled at Maynooth College, August 18, 1869. (Tr.)

[3] According to the *Fifth Report of the Royal Commission*, pp. 25, 26, the sum collected in 1874 was £187,000. (Tr.)

[4] *Freeman's Journal Church Commission*, p. 385. (Tr.)

that set aside for the Presbyterians, be appropriated for the support of that institution. The bill is very lengthy and very detailed, but these are its chief provisions.[1]

The Irish are literally a missionary people, and their influence in carrying the faith to other lands and perpetuating it there can only be properly appreciated by a reference to the statistics of emigration, which was at full tide in 1840. From 1845 to 1854 inclusive, 1,512,100 souls left the country, chiefly for America and Australia; from 1853 to 1860 the average number of immigrants annually to the United States was 71,856, and during the ten following years 69,084; in 1871 it was 65,591; in 1874, 48,136; in 1875, 31,433; and in 1876 only 16,432. The total number of Irish immigrants to the United States for the last thirty years is about two millions. As the great bulk of these settled in the larger cities, their influence upon the growth of Catholicity and the formation of public opinion in regard to the Church can hardly be over-estimated.

Numerous important works have been published within the last forty years by eminent Irish scholars, whose names are known wherever the English language is spoken, and many of their theological writings are of great value. There is hardly a considerable town in the whole island that has not a newspaper Catholic in tone, and doing good service in the interest of the Church. There are also some periodicals of merit, of which it will be sufficient to mention the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, a monthly journal, conducted by a society of clergyman, under the sanction of Cardinal Cullen; *The Irish Monthly*; and the *Carlow College Magazine*.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Clarendon said, in 1660, that the religion of Scotland consisted in an "abhorrence of Popery." The religious history of that country from the date of the Reformation down to very recent times has been a verification of this utterance. As late as the year 1700, a priest coming into the country was liable to the penalty of death, and scarcely any mitigation of this hostile legislation in regard to Catholics took place until the close of the eighteenth century. Still missionaries were not deterred from coming into the country from fear of barbarous enactments. An apostolic vicariate was erected there, in 1695, by Innocent XII., and another by Clement XII. In the year 1800 there were in all Scotland only 15,000 Catholics; by 1850 this number had swelled to 200,000, and by 1864 to 400,000. In 1800 there was not a single priest registered in Scotland; in 1810 there were 21; in 1848, 100; in 1864, 178; in 1873, 225; and at present 1878, 260.

In the year 1800 there was not a Catholic church in the country; in 1810 there was only one; in 1850 there were 93; in 1873, 222; and in 1878, 236. In 1850 Scotland possessed 70 Catholic schools, and in 1864, 13 convents of females.

By the bull *Quanta lætitia affecti simus*, of February, 13, 1827, Leo XII. divided the country into three Districts or Apostolic Vicariates, the Eastern, Western, and Northern. As has been stated in a preceding paragraph, there is a seminary at Blairs, on the right bank of the Dee, approved by the Propaganda in 1832, and another, under the patronage of St. Felix, at Giffordhall, both in the Eastern District. On the occasion of the golden jubilee of the consecration of Pius IX. as bishop, the Vicars Apostolic of Scotland asked for the restoration of the hierarchy to that country, and received a promise that their request would be granted as soon as the condition of the Church there would warrant the measure. The papers relative to the subject were printed, and on the 19th of January, 1878, delivered to Cardinal Franchi for distribution to the Cardinals of the Congregation of the Propaganda for action at their meeting to be held on the 28th of the same month.[2] On the 29th, or the day after the meeting of the cardinals, Pope Pius IX. († February 7, 1878) restored the hierarchy to Scotland. *St. Andrews* and *Glasgow* were made archiepiscopal sees; and the four sees of *Aberdeen*, *Galloway* (with seat at Dumfries), *Dunkeld* (with seat at Perth), and *Argyll* and the Isles (with seat at Oban), were made suffragan to St. Andrews.[3]

§ 418. *In Germany and Switzerland.*

† *Beda Weber*, Pen-pictures of the Life of the Church in Germany, Mentz, 1858.

After the Treaty of Westphalia, Protestants gained the ascendancy in Germany, and their newly-acquired power was used to

[1] See *The Catholic World* for May, 1869. [2] *London Tablet* of January 26, 1878. (Tr.)
[3] *Liverpool Times*, February 1, 1878. (Tr.)

oppress the Church. A spirit of religious indifferentism began to spread among the people, which the evil influence of Rationalism, the natural ally of Protestantism, did much to strengthen and perpetuate. The terrible and disastrous *effects that followed the French Revolution* were still felt. The Church was spoiled of her possessions; her external organization was shattered by the suppression of bishoprics, chapters, and convents; and she was no longer permitted to govern herself. This state of affairs was slightly, but only slightly, improved by the concordats entered into with the Holy See. (See § 396.) The Catholics of Germany began to lose heart; they no longer dared to speak out and demand their rights. There was also a blight upon their intellectual life; scientific and theological works from their pens became daily more rare, until finally they ceased almost entirely to appear.

The following causes contributed to rouse them from this state of lethargy, to attach them more warmly to the Church, and, in consequence, to make them more active and zealous in her defence:

I. At the opening of the nineteenth century, a number of *illustrious converts* came into the Church. The first of these was *Count Frederic Leopold Von Stolberg*, who was shortly followed by *Frederic Schlegel*, *Charles Louis Haller*, *Adam Müller*, *Beckedorf*, *Jarke*, *Phillips*, the two *Möllers*, *Herbst*, the laborious *Louis Clarus* (Völk), *Hurter*, *Gfrörer*, *Ida Hahn*, *Daumer*, *Lämmer*, *Krafft*, *Baumstark*, and many others.[1] Ardently devoted to the Church, and loving her with an enthusiastic love, these Catholic champions set themselves to the work of defending her doctrines, and portraying to the world her manifold beauties.

II. The outrageous abuse and the vile calumnies heaped upon Count Stolberg and other converts to Catholicity; the celebration, between the years 1817 and 1846, of *jubilees*, commemorating the third centenary of the introduction *of Protestantism* into various countries; and the malignant hatred against the Church displayed by Protestants on these occasions, their wanton outrage of the feelings of Catholics, and their extravagant honours to the memory of Luther,[2] revived the dormant spirit of faith among the sons of the Church, and taught them that if they would be helped, they must help themselves. First of all, it was necessary to set themselves right before the public, to defend Catholic doctrine, to correct misrepresentation, to brand calumnies as they deserved, and for this purpose they started the excellent periodicals, *The Catholic of Mentz* and *The Theological Quarterly of Tübingen*. Again, they began to make *historical research* a serious study, pursuing their labours with greater zeal and profit as days went on, thereby exposing and dissipating a cloud of falsehoods and misrepresentations in writers of both

[1] *Rosenthal*, Life Pictures of Converts in the Nineteenth Century, Schaffhausen, 1865 sq., 3 vols., with Supplement.

[2] *Constantine Christ* (nom de plume), Examination of the Sermons of Living Reformers, in Relation to Tolerance in the Nineteenth Century, Ratisbon, 1845.

ecclesiastical and civil history, which, as *De Maistre* truthfully remarked, has been for the last three hundred years "a conspiracy against the truth." The Catholics of Germany appreciated the fact that if they would put the truth clearly before the minds of their countrymen, set forth the nature, the characteristics, and the dignity of the Church, and facilitate the return of their separated brethren to her fold, they must retake the ground they had lost in the field of history, and this they proceeded to do, and did triumphantly. No man of Germany probably exercised a more decisive influence in this movement than the gifted *Joseph von Görres;* and it is a significant fact that it was precisely a calm and judicial study of the history of the Church in the Middle Ages that led men like *Hurter* and *Gfrörer* to profess her teachings, and made *John Frederic Böhmer*, of Frankfort, one of the most profound historical students of this century, whose delight it was to be styled an "*Apologist of the Church*," the head of a numerous school of Catholic historians, with whom the study of the Middle Ages was a specialty.[1]

III. The "*Symbolism*" of *Möhler*, contrasting the dogmatic differences between Catholics and Protestants, as set forth in the Confessions of each, appeared immediately after the centenary jubilee, commemorating the Diet and the Confession of Augsburg, and produced upon the public mind a sensation similar to that of a clap of thunder in a clear sky. The doctrines of the Catholic Church and those of Lutheranism and the Reformed Church are here set side by side in so striking, luminous, and masterly a way, that Protestant theologians, who had heretofore pursued the policy of superciliously ignoring the writings of Catholics, feeling they could do so no longer with safety, now published many criticisms of the work, and made it the text of lectures in their universities, doing their best, but in vain, to refute it. The Universities of Tübingen and Munich, with both of which this great writer was connected, may be justly proud of his fame, which has added not a little to their own. On his tomb is inscribed the epitaph: "*The Defender of the Faith, the Ornament of Letters, the Comfort of the Church*," which will tell to future generations the work done by this great man for Catholicity, particularly in Germany.

IV. This work, together with what is known as the *Catastrophe*, or, more properly, the *Event of Cologne*,[2] produced a wide and profound impression in Germany. It was at this time that the

[1] Of the disciples of Böhmer, it will be sufficient to name Aschbach, Ficker, Höfler, Janssen, Junkmann, Stumpf, and Will. The historians, *Chmel* and *Kopp*, the former an Austrian and the latter a Swiss, and Lütolf of Lucerne took pride in calling him their master, and imitating him as their model. *Potthast* of Berlin followed Böhmer's method of using sources. Of the Catholics who have written on *modern* history, the following have gained the greatest name: Cornelius, Kampschulte, Gindely, Koch, Jörg, Holzwarth, Hüffer, and *Onno Klopp*, the last named being thoroughly Catholic in tone. The statesmen, *Alfred von Reumont* and *Baron von Hübner*, have given to their historical works all the grace and elegance of artistic finish. Cf. *Janssen*, The Life, Letters, and Occasional Writings of *J. Fr. Böhmer*, Freiburg, 1868.

[2] See p. 207 sq.

Historico-political Papers began to be issued. It was at this time, too, that *Joseph von Görres* pleaded the cause of the Church, her authority, and her greatness, so manfully, eloquently, and triumphantly, in his *Athanasius* and the *Triarians*, that now, as formerly, by his powerful protests in the *Rhenish Mercury* against the despotism of Napoleon in Germany, he merited the title of "*The Fifth Great Power.*" His dying words, "*The State rules, the Church protests,*" contained a prophecy that has been verified by events.[1]

V. To her surprise and against her will, the Church was at this time aided in her conflict against despotism by the sect of the *Rongeanists*, or, as they preferred to call themselves, *German Catholics.* We shall have occasion to speak again of this sect in a subsequent paragraph.[2]

VI. *The memorable events of the year* 1848 contributed not a little to improve the condition of the Church in Germany. The Revolution that had its origin in France, swept over nearly every country of Europe, and the German sovereigns found themselves forced to grant to their subjects the rights and the freedom that had been so long withheld. This convulsion, though *political* in its origin and essence, was not without its influence upon the Church. But while the thrones of princes were tottering and falling to the ground, the fabric of the Church, strong in the strength of divine organization, bore up under the shock, and now, as when the Roman Empire was going to pieces, stood firm and erect amid surrounding desolation and ruin. Now, as then, it was plain, she contained within herself an imperishable *principle of indefectibility.* To the bishops the present seemed a favourable opportunity to demand for the Church the restoration of those rights, without which it was impossible for her to carry out her high mission. Accordingly, at the invitation of *John von Geissel*, Archbishop of Cologne, *the bishops of Germany met at Würzburg*, and continued in session from the 21st of October to the 16th of November, taking counsel as to the best means of raising the Church from the depth into which she had fallen. The following were the results of their long and arduous labours: 1. They addressed a very able and affectionate *pastoral letter to the Catholics of Germany;* 2. They sent a most pressing and cheering *exhortation to the clergy;* 3. They drew up a *memorial to the German sovereigns*, which the bishops of the respective governments were charged to communicate officially to the proper authorities. In this they said:

"The bishops of Germany *do not desire a separation of Church and State;* they ask only for the fuller liberty and more complete independence of the Church. As to those who differ from them in belief, they will always exhibit that charity, forbearance, and justice so necessary to the peace and well-being of citizens of whatever profession of faith they may be, without, however, giving any countenance to indifferentism, so destructive of every form of religion. *Having received a divine commission to teach*, the

[1] *Jos. Görres*, Complete Works, edited by Marv von Görres. Munich, 1854-1858.
[2] See § 421.

demand the fullest freedom in the matter of education and instruction, including the right of founding and governing their own institutions of learning, of directing their own schools, of administering their own school-funds, of selecting the text-books of religion, of watching over the religious instruction of both the primary and higher schools, and of having the exclusive management of their own seminaries. They declare the interference of the State *in the examination of candidates for admission into clerical seminaries*, and in the competitive trials of priests for parochial appointments, an unwarrantable infringement on the liberty of the Church and the rights of bishops, who alone are competent to judge of the learning and moral character of those desiring to become ministers of the Church. It is a part of the Church's office *to minister to the temporal*, as well as to the spiritual well-being of nations, and to discharge this duty she must be in possession of the necessary freedom. But, above and beyond all, the bishops demand the right, which is theirs by every title, of controlling all matters of *public worship*, and, hence, *of forming religious associations and founding convents.* They further claim *the right of administering all ecclesiastical property;* they protest most solemnly against the injurious imputation that *their relations to the See of Rome* constitute a crime against German nationality, and are dangerous to the State; they denounce as un-German the practice of setting spies to observe what goes on in the intercourse between pastors and their flocks; and, finally, they express their unalterable devotion and attachment to the Head of the Church, the Centre and Pledge of Catholic unity, and declare a *placetum regium*, of whatever character, a violation of the Church's imprescriptible rights, and wholly incompatible with the enjoyment of complete freedom."

On their return to their dioceses, the bishops did their best to carry out the measures to which they had pledged themselves. Those of Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine agreed among themselves to draw up separate memorials, to be presented to their several governments.

The complaints of the bishops obtained a respectful hearing, and, in *Prussia*, the XIIth, XIIIth, and XVth Articles of the new Constitution embodied the substance of their demands. Article XII. provides that "the Catholic Church, the Evangelical, and all other religious societies, shall direct and administer their own affairs, and that they shall possess and control all houses, foundations, and properties set apart for purposes of worship, education, and charity." By Article XIII., religious associations were permitted to communicate freely with their superiors, and to publish all ordinances, without any restriction, other than was imposed upon publications of any other character. By Article XV., the State cedes the right, hitherto claimed, of nominating and appointing to church-livings, except in cases of patronage, or where special provision is made to the contrary.

In *Austria*, also, the bishops obtained a hearing, and their voice was potent to rouse the Catholics of that country from their lethargy to a zeal and activity that carried the memories of the people back to the days of *Frederic Schlegel* and *Bishop Frint*. After having put down the revolutionary demonstrations of his subjects in the German and Italian provinces and in Hungary, the *Emperor Francis Joseph*, on the 18th of April, 1850, granted, provisionally, until some more satisfactory arrangements could be made, the demands made by the bishops who had met at Vienna on the 15th of July of the preceding year. These were, in substance, that the imperial *placet* should be given up; that the bishops should be permitted to communicate

freely with the Holy See; and that in all matters pertaining to public worship and ecclesiastical discipline they should enjoy the most ample freedom. A *concordat* was concluded between Austria and the Holy See, August 18, 1855, by which the relations of Church and State were definitely established, the emperor renouncing the principles of Josephism, by which the Church had been so long held in bondage. To the bishops who went to thank him for his spirit of fairness to the Church, the emperor remarked: "My wish is to secure the temporal welfare of my subjects, and *not to stand in the way of their eternal salvation.* To this end all my efforts are directed." Notwithstanding that the emperor granted, purely of his own good will, more extensive liberties to the Protestant subjects of his empire than their brethren enjoyed, even in any Protestant State of Germany at that time, this did not prevent the enemies of the Church, both in Austria and other countries of Europe, from crying out and clamouring against the concordat, as they had done on a former occasion in the cases of Würtemberg and Baden; and now, as then, they laboured most strenuously to prevent its execution, and, if possible, to suppress it altogether. For a dozen years after it had been concluded, few, if any, of its provisions were carried into effect; and, strange to say, the first time a really practical effort was made in this direction, it was in regard to the order to be observed in cemeteries in which Catholics and Protestants were alike buried. To allow the controversy to be narrowed down to an issue concerning the dead, while so many questions of vital importance to the living were still unsettled, showed a lack of judgment and tact somewhere. The enemies of the Church still continued to clamour against the concordat, asserting that its provisions were detrimental to the relations, whether civil or religious, which should exist between Catholics and non-Catholics. So persistent and determined was this hostility, and so plausible the arguments by which it was sustained, that many really well-meaning Catholics began to express a wish that the concordat had never been concluded, and were now quite willing to see it either revoked or annulled. When it was finally abolished, August 9, 1870, the event gave greater surprise and pain to the Holy Father than under other circumstances it would have done, from the fact that the moment was one of exceptional gravity and peril to the Holy See. As early as 1868, three laws, highly prejudicial to the interests of the Church, were laid by the Government before the States General, and passed by that body. Of these the first referred to *civil marriage*, the second to *undenominational schools*, and the third to the relations of citizens of *all religious creeds* to each other.

ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF THE UPPER RHINE. (Cf. § 409.)

The conflict between the Church and the civil authority in this province was more bitter and protracted than in any other part of Germany. When, in 1848, the policy pursued by governments in regard to Church and State began to produce its baneful and legitimate results, particularly in Baden, *Vicari*, Archbishop of Freiburg, judged that the

moment had arrived for demanding[1] for the Church the restoration of those rights which had been so long and so persistently withheld, and, above all, of the right of governing herself, without the interference of the civil authority. There were many reasons why at least the Catholic Church in Baden should enjoy full freedom and be the equal of any other before the law. Prussia, then the most considerable Protestant State of Germany, had recently granted more extensive rights and larger liberty to the Church; everything in the German States seemed to indicate a tendency towards uniformity, whether in legislation, in weights and measures, or in coin and taxation; and, finally, the *bulk* of the population of Baden was *Catholic*. The men at the head of the Government failed to appreciate these reasons, or, if appreciating them, declined to act upon them. In 1851, the archbishop and bishops of the other States of the Province of the Upper Rhine drew up a memorial, petitioning their governments for the same rights that had been demanded by Archbishop Vicari. In consequence, the civil representatives of the several States constituting this Ecclesiastical Province came together for consultation at Carlsruhe. In the meantime the *Grand Duke Leopold* died (April 24, 1852), and his death was the occasion of still further widening the breach between the Government of Baden and Archbishop Vicari. On former occasions, some of the ecclesiastical authorities, for whom a violation of conscience had fewer terrors than the thought of giving displeasure to civil governments, had consented to say solemn *Masses of requiem* on the death of Protestant princes. A Mass of this character was now demanded for Duke Leopold. Archbishop Vicari respectfully, but firmly, refused to say it himself or to permit another to do so; first, because he was convinced that Masses should not be offered for persons, who, like Protestants, do not even believe in their efficacy; and next, because an order of the Pope had been lately published in Bavaria, forbidding the saying of such Masses.[2] He, however, ordered other appropriate funeral services for the illustrious duke, in whose death he had lost a munificent benefactor. With these the Government was not content. It insisted upon having a solemn *Mass of requiem*, and promised its protection to such priests as would say it in defiance of the archbishop's order. Some were found base enough to comply, and received the usual reward of men who break faith with their ecclesiastical superiors to secure the favour of the world. When these priests were threatened with punishment the Government *declined* to interfere; but they were let off with the very light penalty of making a spiritual retreat, at St. Peter's Seminary, which was conducted by Father *Roh*, S.J. After waiting in vain for some definite action on the part of the civil authorities, Herman,[3] the *metropolitan*, in February, 1853, summoned the bishops of the suffragan sees of Mentz, Rottenburg, Limburg, and Fulda to meet him in conference at Freiburg. They resolved to send memorials to their respective governments to the effect that they would again, at an early day, set forth their claims and the reasons by which they were supported, and thenceforth act as if they had been granted. Their demands, embodied in a Memorial, dated March 5, 1853, were denied by the governments, and they accordingly met again at Freiburg, and in a Memorial, dated June 18, 1853, after reiterating whatever they had previously said, they added that they could not believe there was any serious intention of doing such extraordinary violence to their consciences, simply because they made certain claims for the Church, which were thought incompatible with the rights of the State, but which, by ordinance of God, are essential to the freedom of ecclesiastical government. They went on to say that these claims had been formerly so completely conceded in Germany that no one thought of questioning them; that they were provided for in the bulls *Provida solersque* and *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam*, containing the stipulations entered into with the Holy See; and that the Church in the Electorate of Hesse, one of the States of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, was at that moment in the enjoyment of nearly all of them.

The bishops claimed the right of full control over the education and appointment of their clergy and the administration of ecclesiastical discipline, whether in regard to priests or laymen; they also claimed the right to build and to possess Catholic schools; to found

---

[1] March 21, 1848.

[2] *Dereser*, a Catholic priest of Carlsruhe, had already raised similar objections on the occasion of the death of the Grand Duke *Charles Frederic*. His language was somewhat intemperate, and his imprudence was punished with exile. Cf. *Catholic Affairs* in Baden, Pt. I., pp. 23, 24; also *The Catholic* of 1828, No. 4; Athanasia, by *Benkert*, Würzburg, 1847, Vol. I., No. 1: *Döllinger*, Rights and Duties of the Church towards the Dead of other Denominations, Freiburg, 1852 (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, 1842).

[3] *Mast*, Dogmatical and Historical Treatise on the Legal Position of Archbishops. Freiburg, 1847.

institutes and form associations, and do whatever else might be necessary to the maintenance and development of religious life; and, finally, to have the complete administration of the property guaranteed to the Church by the Treaty of Westphalia and the Commissioners of the German Empire.

The various governments declined to make any concessions other than those of March 3, 1853, and threatened to proceed against such persons as would go beyond them. Archbishop Herman continued to call upon the *High Consistory* (formerly the Catholic Ecclesiastical Department), either to concede the demands of the Memorial or to resign their positions, threatening them with excommunication in case of refusal. He also insisted that the competitive examinations for admission into ecclesiastical seminaries should be conducted *without the* presence of a *government commissioner*. The Government of Baden appointed (November 7, 1853) *Burger*, Mayor of Freiburg, Mandatory to the Crown, and required that all commands issuing from the archbishop should be submitted to his inspection, or otherwise be declared void; and that any of the clergy obeying the archbishop's instructions should be punished as common criminals. The archbishop in turn excommunicated both the members of the High Consistory and the Mandatory to the Crown, and published a Pastoral Letter, protesting against the encroachments of the civil authority upon his rights. Shortly after, he appointed to several vacant parishes, to which neither the Government nor private individuals possessed the right of presentation. The Government now began to carry out its threat of November, 1853, by arresting and imprisoning priests who yielded obedience to their archbishop; but as they were nearly all found to be guilty, the inconvenience arising from their apprehension in a body, and the possible danger of such a measure, were appreciated, and they were considerately let off with fines, bearing no proportion to the charges that were brought against them.

Pius IX. protested against the action of the Government in two *allocutions*, the one dated December 19, 1853, and the other January 9, 1854; and the episcopate of Europe and America, diocesan societies and associations, and even individual distinguished laymen of name, sent letters and addresses expressing their sympathy with the archbishop and their admiration of his courage.

By new ordinances of April 18th and May 6th and 18th, the Government still further encroached upon the rights of the Church in the *administration of ecclesiastical property*. Against these the archbishop protested, May 5, 1854, stating that, according to *Canon Law*, local ecclesiastical property should be administered by a board of trustees, sworn to conscientiously perform their duties. These events roused considerable indignation in the Catholic districts, and it was feared that some demonstration might be made against the Government. To prevent this, large bodies of troops were brought together where danger was most apprehended, and the public discontent was considerably augmented by the prevailing scarcity of food. The archbishop was placed under arrest, and *criminal proceedings* were instituted against him on the ground that he had violated his oath of allegiance and fidelity to the laws of the country. From the 23rd to the 30th of May his palace was guarded by soldiers, and during this interval the churches of his diocese wore an aspect of mourning. The bells ceased to ring, and the organs were hushed; the only sounds heard were the accents of prayer, as the faithful implored the divine aid for their courageous pastor. When he was again set at liberty the archbishop defended himself against the charges imputed to him, in a pastoral letter, which was read from all the pulpits of his diocese on the 3rd of June, 1854. In this, the venerable old man, now eighty-two years of age, triumphantly vindicated his conduct, and showed that, in a season of almost general defection, he had remained loyal to the State. In the meantime, the Government sent Count *Leiningen*, and, some time later, *Brunner*, Counsellor of State, to Rome, to open negotiations with the Holy See. The bishops of the Upper Rhine had declared in their Memorial that, in the case the Government should succeed in adjusting the existing difficulties with the Holy Father, "they would cheerfully submit to the ordinances and instructions of Rome." After protracted and wearisome delays, the so-called *Preliminary Articles* were agreed upon at Rome on the 17th of June and the 7th of September. It was agreed that all legal proceedings against both the archbishop and his clergy should be withdrawn, and that Church property should be administered as it had been before the commencement of the controversy. The archbishop, on his part, consented to forego, for the time being, his contested rights, and content himself with the privilege, of naming appointees to vacant parishes, under the title of *parish vicars*, to whom the Government allowed the usual emoluments.

A *convention* between Würtemberg and the Holy See was concluded July 22, 1857, and in publishing it the Government honestly stated[1] "that it was only just to listen to

[1] *Dr. Florian Riess, S.J.*, The Würtemberg Concordat, an Essay. Freiburg, 1858.

the demands of the bishops representing the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, *inasmuch as it was freely admitted that the condition of ecclesiastical affairs there was abnormal, and by no means in accord with the prescriptions of Canon Law.*" A *similar convention* was concluded on the 28th of June, 1859, between the *Grand Duke of Baden* and *Pius IX.*[1]

These conventions were of short duration. The Protestants met in *conference at Durlach*, and with the aid of some liberal Catholics and a majority of the professors of the University of Freiburg, created such an agitation that when the Convention of Baden came before the Chambers it was promptly rejected, March 30, 1860. The Würtemberg Convention was similarly rejected, March 16, 1861. Both the Pope and the archbishop protested against this flagrant violation of solemn engagements, but to no purpose; the governments and the chambers were equally determined to sustain their action. In Baden a more liberal law than had previously existed was passed for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, which, Minister Lamey said, embodied the substance of the convention just annulled.[2] A law of a similar character, passed January 30, 1862, was substituted for the convention by the Government of Würtemberg. Bishop *Von Ketteler*, who placed little reliance in the conventions entered into with Rome by the governments of this Ecclesiastical Province, made a personal appeal to that of Hesse-Darmstadt in behalf of his own diocese of Mentz.[3] He secured moderately favourable terms, but like those agreed upon between Rome and Baden and Würtemberg, they met with opposition in the Upper Chamber, in 1866, and he was in consequence obliged to relinquish them, expressing the hope, however, that the Government, while executing the existing laws, would exercise such wisdom and moderation as might seem necessary to guarantee the rights and advance the interests of the Catholic Church. Archbishop Von Vicari adopted a similar policy, and as early as November, 1861, came to an understanding with the authorities of the Grand Duchy of Baden concerning certain provisions of the Law of October 9, 1860. The adjustment of difficulties was rendered comparatively easy in his case from the fact that Paragraphs I. and VII. of the Law guaranteed the independence of the Church. Having expressed a wish that the Government would secure the Church in the enjoyment

---

[1] The following are the titles of the acts and principal documents referring to this controversy: The Restoration of Canon Law in the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, by a German Statesman, Stuttg., 1853. Memorial of the Episcopate of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Fbg., 1853. Reply of the Archbp. of Freiburg to the Decree of the Grand Duchy of Baden, dated March 5, 1853. Fbg., 1853. Examination of the Resolutions adopted by the Governments of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine on the occasion of the Bishops' Memorial of March 5, 1853, Schaffhausen, 1853. The Rights of the Church, in connection with the Eccl. Controversy in Baden, with special reference to the Lawfulness of Excommunication, etc., Mentz, 1853. *Hirscher*, Hints in Aid of a Just View of the Present Eccl. Controversy, Fbg., 1854. *Lieber*, On the Affairs of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Fbg., 1853. *Baron von Ketteler*, Bp. of Mentz, The Rights and Legal Guarantees of the Cath. Church in Germany, Mentz, 1854. (*Seitz*), The Legal Relations of the Cath. Bps. of Germany to the Governments of the German States, Mentz, 1854. *C. Bader*, An Exposition of the Controversy, based on Public Documents, in the "*German Quarterly*" of 1854, nros. 65, 66, 68; and by the *same*, The Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Frbg., 1860. *Addresses* to the Most Rev. Archbishop Herman von Vicari, from Various Parts of the Catholic World, occasioned by the Eccl. Controversy in Baden, Mentz, 1854, 4 nros. The writings of his *adversaries* are given by *Warnkönig*, On the Conflict of the Episcopacy of the Prov. of the Upper Rhine with the Civil Government, Erlangen, 1853. Other Hints on the True Nature (auch zur Orientirung über) of the Present Eccl. Controversy, with Reference to Hirscher's Writings, Carlsruhe, 1854. State Sovereignty and Church Authority, being a Letter to Hirscher, Darmstadt, 1854. Truth and Semblance (against Hirscher), Carlsruhe, 1854. Archbp. Herman of Freiburg and the Government of Baden, Lps., 1854. The Bishops' Struggle on the Rhine, Frcft., 1854. *Venedey*, The Pataria of the XIth and XIXth Centuries (against the addresses to the Archbp.), Aarau, 1854.

[2] **Dr. Maas*, The Convention of Baden and the Legal Proceedings arising out of its Execution (Archives of Cath. Can. Law, by *Moy*, 1860 and 1861). The work was published separately at Innsbruck, 1861, together with an account of the literature relating to the same subject.

[3] *Dr. Seitz*, The Affair of the Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, Mentz, 1861.

of her existing rights, in regard to *Catholic schools, foundations*, and *revenues*, he received a promise, on the 5th of November, 1861, that no change would be made in these matters. In the face of these pledges, and in defiance of the protests of the archbishop and the remonstrances of the Catholic subjects of the Grand Duchy, a sovereign edict was issued, August 12, 1862, providing for the organization of an Undenominational School Board, declaring Catholic schools *institutions of the State*, and taking the administration of the funds set apart for the support of Catholic establishments of learning and charity, from the Catholic Committee on foundations, and transferring it to non-Catholic State officials, to whom, it was said, it of right belonged. This was a bolder stroke than had yet been dealt at the liberties of the Catholics. It brought the controversy home to their own doors. To have their children deprived of such education as they wished to give them was something they could fully understand and appreciate. They held public meetings, organized public demonstrations, and availed themselves of every possible legal means to express their dissatisfaction with the school-law and to place obstacles in the way of its execution. The clergy, though no longer *ex officio* directors of education, were still eligible to the office of School Commissioners; but the archbishop forbade them to take any position on the Boards, and ordered them to confine themselves in the matter of education to the instruction of the people in religious truths. This deprived the Commission, particularly in the rural districts, of the assistance of the only persons capable of properly superintending and managing the schools, a circumstance that was seriously detrimental to the interests of national education. On the 14th of July, 1864, Pope Pius IX. addressed a letter to Herman von Vicari, Archbishop of Freiburg, praising the constancy and courage of that prelate in defending the rights of the Church, particularly in the matter of education. Education, said the Holy Father, without religious training and instruction, can produce only an impious and a perverse generation. This is pre-eminently true of primary instruction. In primary schools, in which are gathered together the tender youth of all classes, religious instruction must invariably hold the first place, and all other branches be subservient and accessory to it. Hence, such schools must of necessity be under the care and protection of the Church, and all attempts to withdraw them from her guardianship and authority spring from a desire to extinguish the divine light of faith among peoples and nations. Those who aim at separating religion from education, and expelling the influence of the Church from the schoolroom, aim equally at overthrowing her empire over souls, and ask her to forego the work of man's salvation. It is, therefore, the duty of the Church, not only to insist upon her right of imparting religious instruction in the schoolroom, but also to warn Catholic parents that schools from which Catholic teaching is excluded can hardly, if at all, be frequented with a safe conscience.[1]

In the midst of these politico-religious agitations, the archbishop, broken in health and borne down with weight of years, ended his troubled episcopate at the age of ninety-five, April 13, 1868. He had celebrated, on the 25th of the preceding month, his silver jubilee, or twenty-fifth anniversary, as metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, amid the general rejoicing of the Catholics of his flock.

Owing to the difficulties, which necessarily arose between the Metropolitan Chapter and the Government, in the selection of a proper person to succeed to the see, it has continued vacant down to the present moment. An understanding, however, has been arrived at between the civil authorities, on the one hand, and the Vicar-Capitular and titular Bishop, *Dr. Kübel*, on the other, concerning the administration of Church property and the admission of priests to serve on local School Boards, but it is only provisional and temporary.[2]

Contrasting the Church in Germany since 1848 with her condition at the opening of the century, we see many tokens of a revival of religious life and of the enjoyment of a larger freedom, which are very consoling to those who have her interests at heart. At the close

1 Cf. Archives of Canon Law, 1864. (Tr.)

2 The publishing house of *Herder*, at Freiburg, has issued the following works relative to the school question: Memorial of the Archbishop of Freiburg on the Condition of Schools, 1863; Official Documents on the School Question in Baden, First Number (1864), Second (1866); Memorial of the Catholic Clergy of the Grand Duchy of Baden concerning Reform in the Public Schools, 1863.

of the last century and the beginning of this, everything seemed hastening to destruction or already in ruins; Catholic progress had nearly ceased; Catholic life had become almost extinct; everyone appeared possessed of a fatal spirit of listlessness and indifference men of scientific attainments had lost all manliness and dignity, and either abstained altogether from speaking out in defence of the Church, or, if they did so at all, their hesitating accents and faltering words showed but too plainly that their loyalty to truth was seriously impaired by their dread of giving offence to princes and sovereigns.

Things have now everywhere undergone a change more or less encouraging. The Church has recovered from the effects of secularization, and her external organization is again restored; she is now poor, and no longer tempts cupidity or excites envy her interests, heretofore neglected, or only indifferently promoted, are now jealously guarded by an active and vigilant *press*;[1] firmness and courage have succeeded to hesitancy and cowardice; formerly, wholly ignored or eliciting only the contemptuous pity of Protestants, she now causes them intense and unnecessary alarm, and provokes their malignant hostility To them Catholics say, in the words of St. Ambrose: "*We have no wish to frighten you, nor will we be frightened by you, 'Nec terremus nec timemus.'*"

We see ample proofs of this revival of Catholicity in Germany in the increased freedom enjoyed by the bishops, and in the zeal and energy with which they take up and carry forward whatever promotes the interests or contributes to the glory of the Church. At the beginning of the century they were indifferent, if not actually hostile, to the Head of the Church; they are now among his ablest defenders and most ardent sympathisers. *Melchior von Diepenbrock, John von Geissel, Othmar von Rauscher,*[2] *Herman von Vicari,* and a number of other bishops, encouraged and stimulated by the example of the illustrious archbishops, *Clemens Augustus von Droste* and *Martin von Dunin,*[3] displayed in the government of their several dioceses a vigorous and varied activity quite unknown for years in Germany. *Provincial and diocesan synods,* which had been long interrupted, were again held. Pastoral letters were written, as the occasion required, whose spirit carries the mind to the early days of the Church. After the pattern of the Fathers, the bishops wrote

[1] The following are the headings of the subjects treated in a work entitled *The Catholic Press of Germany,* published at Freiburg, in Brisgovia, in 1861: 1. Political papers; 2. Purely ecclesiastical organs; 3. Periodicals devoted to science, literature, and art; 4. Journals and magazines devoted to political and social science and belles-lettres. Cf., also, The Power of the Press, or a Word in Season, Ratisbon, 1866. *Molitor,* The Organization of the Catholic Daily Press, Spire, 1867; and *J. Lukas,* The Press an Instrument of Confusion, Ratisbon, 1867.

[2] Card. *Von Rauscher,* Pastoral, Sermons, and Addresses. Vienna, 1860.

[3] See p. 207 sq.

treatises upon great religious and social questions, which, for eloquence and beauty of style, will compare favourably with their great models. The sacerdotal spirit was revived, strengthened, and kept alive by *spiritual retreats*, held annually; and the better to keep their energies from flagging and their zeal from growing cold, many of the priests, on the eleven-hundredth anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, in 1855, solemnly pledged themselves to repair once in the year to *Fulda*, for the purpose of going through the spiritual exercises. The *right of association*, which was also recognized as inherent in the Church, gave rise to numerous *congregations of men and women*. Apart from the fact that these are essential to the full development of Christianity, they are also necessary to minister to the wants of society.[1] This was acknowledged by Napoleon I., who, at the conclusion of the concordat of 1801, declared: "I have need of monasteries for great crimes, great virtues, and great misfortunes." These institutions, to which so much hostility was manifested at the beginning of the century, now rose rapidly in public favour. Not content with reviving religious life by cultivating a spirit of prayer within the walls of their convents, and going about giving missions to the people, the religious of both sexes ministered to the wants and relieved the sufferings of all classes of society with a spirit of loving generosity and disinterested self-sacrifice at once admirable and heroic. Emulating the French Sisters of Charity in the war of the Crimea, the female religious of Germany moved like angels of mercy over the battle-fields of Schleswig-Holstein in 1864; of Bohemia, during the fratricidal war of 1866; and of France, during the war of 1870, encouraging the living and comforting the dying.

Associations of laymen were also formed, who vied with the religious in works of charity and general beneficence. The first of these was organized at Mentz, the metropolitan see of St. Boniface, and called the "*Pius Society*," after the then illustrious Head of the Church. In their first *General Congress*, from the 3rd to the 5th of October, 1848, presided over by *Von Buss*, of Freiburg, one of the ablest champions of the Catholic cause,[2] they resolved that all the Catholic societies of Germany should form a Union, to be known as "*The Catholic Association of Germany;*" that its character should be not political but *purely religious;* that it should be entirely subject to the Pope, the bishops, and the clergy; and that general congresses should be held at intervals, to be determined by the last General Congress. Its *objects* were stated to be to secure, and retain the *liberties* necessary for

[1] Cf. Vol. I., p. 522, "Freiburg Kirchenblatt," nros. 23-25, of the year 1858, and the magnificent speech of *Dr. Moufang* in the Eleventh General Assembly of the Catholic Associations at Freiburg in 1859, in the official report, pp. 223-230. Cf., also, *Schels*, The Modern Religious Congregations of Women and their Legal Relations, Schaffhausen, 1857. *Schuppe*, The Nature and Legal Position of Modern Religious Associations of Women, Mentz, 1869.

[2] Cf. *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theology since the Council of Trent, pp. 513-516.

the Catholic Church in the exercise of her legitimate functions; to promote *the religious and social condition of the people* by teaching and example; and, above all, to cultivate among its members a love for works of Christian charity. The bishops assembled at Würzburg, November 13, 1848, expressed their entire approval of the Association, and Pius IX., writing from Gaëta, February 10, 1849, did the same, and graciously conferred upon it his apostolic benediction.[1] From this time forth *General Congresses* were held annually in one of the principal cities of Germany.[2] These were attended by large numbers of the loyal children of the Church, both clerical and lay, and gave a powerful stimulus to religious life and works of Christian charity. At the very first General Congress, the *Societies of St. Vincent de Paul* and *St. Elizabeth* were founded; and in the succeeding Congresses the *Society of St. Boniface*, for providing missions for Catholics whose lot is cast among Protestants, and the *Trades Union Association*, were founded and perfected. Some idea may be had of the good accomplished by the St. Boniface Society from the fact that since its organization the missions, which it was designed to promote, have increased sixty-one per cent. The Trades Union, which has about sixty thousand members, is of vast importance from a social point of view. Among those who laboured most earnestly for its success were *Adolphus Kolping*, of Cologne, a man thoroughly acquainted with the social condition of the poor; *Alban Stolz*, of Freiburg, the gifted Catholic popular writer; and *Dr. A. Gruscha*, of Vienna. *The Society for Catholic Art*, *The Vienna Catholic Literary Gazette* (since 1854), and *The Society for the Publication of Pamphlets*, all had their origin in these Congresses of the Catholic Association of Germany. Among the other enterprises proposed by it were the foundation of a free *Catholic University;* the support of eminent Catholic scholars; the religious care of the Catholic Germans dispersed in the various capitals of Europe; the organization of Catholic committees on emigration at Hamburg, Antwerp, and Havre; the spread of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin in all the callings of life, but particularly among the younger merchants; the publication of *tracts for the times*,[3] with a view to refuting the slanders of the anti-Catholic press, and disarming prejudice against the Church; the investigation of the *questions concerning workingmen;* and, finally, the devising of the most efficient means for resisting the threatened danger of *separation of Church and School.* The Association also solemnly protested, time and again, against the invasion

[1] For a detailed statement of their origin and operations, cf. the "Official Report" of the Eleventh General Assembly at Freiburg, in Brisgovia, *ibid.*, 1860, pp. 15-35.

[2] They were held successively at Mentz, 1848; Breslau, 1849; Ratisbon; Linz; Mentz; Münster; Vienna; Lintz; Salzburg; Cologne, 1858; Freiburg; Prague; Munich; Aix-la-Chapelle; Frankfort-on-the-Main; Würzburg; Treves, 1865; in 1866 suspended by reason of the German fratricidal war; Innsbruck, 1867; Bamberg, 1868; Düsseldorf, 1869; in 1870 no Congress, on account of the Franco-German War; Mentz, 1871. An *official report* of each Congress was made and published.

[3] Published at Soest, Münster, Frankfort-on-the-Main, and at Vienna.

and sacrilegious usurpation of the States of the Church; against the persecution of Catholics in Poland and Ireland, in Mecklenburg and Schleswig-Holstein; and against the injustice done to Catholics in the States of Germany, where, though legally and theoretically enjoying equal rights with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they were far from doing so practically and in reality.[1] The words uttered in the Congresses literally went out to the ends of all Germany, everywhere evoking a hearty response, stirring up the zeal of the faithful, and kindling anew a love for the old Church.

Generous donations of money were contributed by the members, with the aid of which new parishes were organized, and many new churches built in the pure Gothic style, while those that were unfinished were completed, and those going to decay restored. The ornamentation of these churches, both in the interior and on the exterior, was symbolical of the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, commemorative of events in the lives of the Saints of God, and in the most approved style of *revived Christian art*. There were tokens everywhere of greater zeal and earnestness. The people grew more religious, the churches were more thronged, the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist were more frequented, *pilgrimages* and other *extraordinary forms of devotion* gained in popular favour, and a decided preference was manifested for the grave and stately church music of earlier ages and for the older forms of prayer and meditation, whose efficacious, sweet, and soothing influence over mind and heart was soon apparent. The face of the land seemed changed, and it was this vision of beauty that impelled *Beda Weber*, a disciple of St. Benedict, and one of the most loyal sons of the Church, who has given so ravishing a picture of it in his *Cartoons*, to cry out in a spirit of exultant gladness, shortly before his death, that he rejoiced to see Germany once more openly Catholic. But the picture, though beautiful in the foreground, had dark shadows in the distance. The enthusiasm of the people, as will always happen in great revivals of faith and devotion, carried them in some instances to excess. Outward demonstration was mistaken for true piety of heart, eccentricity for more rigorous observance, and moroseness for austerity. Miracles without warrant and prophecies without authentication gained credence with the multitude, and upright men were shocked to witness the scandalous lives of some who professed to be practical Catholics. Nor was this all. Many, yielding to the materialistic tendencies of the age, to its selfishness and its sensuality, ceased to act from principle or from high motives, and lost all steadiness and nobility of character. They grew indifferent to the Church, careless of her interests, neglectful of her ministrations, and, not unfrequently, declaimed against her teachings, and avowed themselves her open enemies. In a word,

[1] Cf. Memorial on the Equality of Rights (of Catholics and Protestants) at the *University of Bonn*, Freiburg, in Brisgovia, 1862; Illustration of the Equality of Rights in Prussia in Regard to Higher and Intermediate Schools, *ibid.*, 1862.

and it is well to say it openly before the world—never have apostasies from the Church and from Christianity itself been more numerous and alarming than in our own day. "It is doubtful," said *Vincent Gasser*, Prince-Bishop of Brixen, "if the Catholic Church has ever had to sustain more terrible assaults. When she first set out on her march of victory over the world, she found the human race sunk in materialism, and sick with the sickness of death. But the poison was then external to her. It has now shown marks of its presence in her own body."[1]

The history of Catholicity in *Switzerland* presents an alternation of good and bad fortune.[2] Two causes may be mentioned as mainly instrumental in remedying the evils consequent upon the suppression of the convents in Argovia and the disastrous war of the *Sonderbund*. In the first place, the *bishops* were zealous, active, and laborious, and some of them, of whom *Dr. Greith* was the most eminent, were accomplished writers; and next, the laymen, with that natural genius for organization so peculiar to their countrymen, formed associations for various charitable purposes. Such was the character of the *Society of Pius IX.*, the *Society of Students*, and the *Society of Artists*. When fresh controversies arose between the civil authorities of Argovia, on the one side, and the Bishop of Bâle-Soleure and the Papal Nuncio, on the other, concerning *mixed marriages;* and in the Canton of St. Gall, concerning the school question, the power of the *Catholic press*, its ability, and harmony of action, attracted universal attention.[3] After the accession to power at *Geneva* of *James Fazy* and his political adherents, who professed a liberal policy towards the Church, Bishop *Marilley*, who had been since 1848 the victim of unceasing persecution, and was now in exile, was permitted to return to his diocese (1856), and on the 8th of September, 1859, dedicated a magnificent Gothic church to the Blessed Virgin, in the presence of four bishops and one hundred and fifty priests, in the very citadel of Calvinism, where, until the year 1793, it had been a capital offence to say Mass. In 1872, this venerable confessor of the faith was succeeded in the see of Geneva by Bishop *Mermillod*, an eloquent preacher and a capable administrator.

The growth of Catholicity in the home of Calvin and the nursery of his teachings is very considerable, whether the number or the influence of its professors be considered. In 1866, when it was proposed to force upon the country some objectionable reforms, the Catholics unanimously opposed them, and largely contributed to their rejection. The revival of learning and religious life in Switzerland is mainly the work of the Benedictines of the venerable *monastery of Einsiedeln*, among whom there have been many writers

[1] Cf. his speech, delivered at the Eighteenth General Congress of the Catholic Association, at Innsbruck, 1867.

[2] See § 405.

[3] The Swiss Gazette; The Ecclesiastical Gazette of Switzerland, published at Soleure: The Literary and Artistic Paper of Lucerne; the Catholic School Journal of Switzerland; the Historical Papers of Switzerland, etc.

of distinguished merit, like Fathers Gallus Morel and Charles Brandes. The ancient monastery of *Rheinau*, after an unbroken existence of eleven hundred years, was suppressed, in 1862, by the government of the Canton of Zürich; and the last remaining convent of women in the Canton of Argovia, situated at Baden, was closed in 1867. But, strange to say, there are at present more convents and religious institutions in Catholic Switzerland than she possessed before the war of the Separate Confederacy. There appears, however, to be no end to the persecution of the Church in that country. In 1859, the right of jurisdiction, hitherto enjoyed by the Bishops of Milan and Como, in the Canton of *Tessino*, was abrogated; the right of dismissing pastors and appointing others to their places vested in the individual congregations; the entire superintendence of worship placed in the hands of the police; and Catholic schools were closed. The spirit of persecution once more broke out in Geneva; the teaching Orders were driven out; Bishop *Mermillod*, the Vicar-Apostolic, expelled (February 17, 1873); laws enacted for the regulation of worship; and pastors, who refused to take the oath, deposed, and apostate priests appointed in their room. *Dr. Greith* has set forth, in a number of memorials, the persecutions suffered by the Catholics of the Canton of St. Gall, of which he was bishop. But perhaps no diocese of Switzerland was so severely tried as that of *Basle*. The Deputies of the seven Cantons comprising this diocese, assembled in conference, decided to close the ecclesiastical seminary of Soleure, which had been opened in 1858, many convents in the various Cantons having been previously suppressed. The Deputies also sent a peremptory command to Mgr. *E. Lachat*, Bishop of Basle, to explain his course in regard to papal infallibility, and to withdraw the sentence of excommunication passed upon the Old Catholic pastors, *Egli*, *Gschwind*, and others. The bishop, having refused compliance, was deposed on the 29th of January, 1873, and on the 17th of the following April expelled from Soleure. In the mountains of Jura the priests, who are sufficiently loyal and courageous to obey their bishops, expiate their fidelity either in prison or exile; and in the meantime, the people are deprived of the ministrations of religion, as they refuse to have anything to do with apostate priests, who come to fill the places of those taken from them. The Catholic Church of Zürich was taken from its legal owners, and given to the "Old Catholics," whose preachers, acting under the inspiration of Radicals, the enemies of all religion, go up and down the country heaping abuse and slander upon Catholics and their faith. The bishops have again and again sent expostulations to the Federal Council, complaining of these wrongs, and the Papal Nuncio has frequently protested against this abridgment of the liberties of the Church by those who profess to be the champions of freedom, but neither expostulations nor protests have produced the slightest effect. The Holy Father, Pius IX., often sent words of encouragement and comfort to the Swiss, and on the 21st of November, 1873,

condemned the action of the Federal Council, whereupon this body, in January, 1874, ordered the Papal Nuncio to leave the country.[1]

But, apart from these persecutions, the progress of the Church in Switzerland has been rapid and important, and no one has contributed more to it than the Capuchin, *Theodosius Florentini*,[2] Vicar-General of Coire, who died February 15, 1865.

This child of the mountains exercised a wonderful influence over the minds of men. He was tall of stature, his constitution was robust, and his carriage manly and dignified; he was skilled in philosophy and theology, and was gifted with an eminently practical mind and a heart delicately sensitive to the spiritual and corporal needs of his fellow-men. Few men have been more devoted to the Church, more active in her interests, and more reliant on God. He was by turn a school-master, a professor, a parish-priest, a manufacturer, and a vicar-general, and his success in these various and varied positions was uniform and remarkable. He founded *schools and academies for boys and girls*, and provided them with competent teachers; he opened *hospitals* and *orphanages;* he introduced silk-weaving, straw-platting, knitting, and the manufacture of cotton into various districts of Switzerland; and the manufacture of woollen goods into far-away Bohemia; and was thus instrumental in banishing poverty from these localities; but his thoughts were chiefly occupied with founding monastic houses and providing religious instruction for the people. Having perfected the organization and discipline of existing monasteries, and directed the energies of their inmates to the work contemplated by their founders, he established at *Schwytz* the *College of Mary of Help*, including a lyceum, a gymnasium, a smaller seminary, and a training school, to which he appointed eleven clerical and eight lay professors. But the most splendid creation of his zeal was the *Hospital of the Holy Cross* at Coire, to which a novitiate of the Sisters of Charity was attached, until the foundation of their house at *Ingenbohl*, from which so many of these devoted heroines go forth to carry the blessings of their ministrations to the neighbouring districts. They were called the *Sisters of Charity of the Holy Cross*. The range of their employment was wide and varied, and they spread rapidly through the Cantons of Switzerland, and established missions in Austria, the Grand Duchy of Baden, and Prussia. Millions of money were required to start these numerous enterprises and keep them going, but Father Theodosius never seemed to want; his inventive charity provided means where utter failure would have overtaken others. Whenever he felt that there was a call upon him to relieve some pressing need of his fellow-men, seizing his pilgrim's staff, he would set forth on foot, traversing Italy from the Alps to the Straits of Messina, preaching along the whole route of his journey, and collecting for his contemplated works of benevolence and charity. He would do the same in Switzerland, in Bavaria, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, and in Austria, where especially his appeals met with a prompt and generous response. His easy address and winning manners won him the good will and esteem of those not of his own faith. The last words penned by his hand express the rule of his life and contain the secret of his success. When on his death-bed at Heiden, in the Canton of *Appenzell*, being requested by one of the company of the friends who stood by him to leave them some remembrance, he wrote on the page of a memorandum book this old Catholic maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.*

§ 419. *Catholic Literature in Germany since the Opening of the Nineteenth Century.*

* Thesaurus librorum rei catholicæ. Manual of Catholic Bibliography, Würzburg, 1848-1850, 2 vols. *Hülskamp* and *Rump*, Literary Guide (Literarischer Handweiser), 1862-1866. To this is added the very practical alphabetical index. †*Charles Werner*, Hist. of Catholic Theology in Germany from the Council of Trent, Munich, 1866. By the *same*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature, Vol. V., Schaffhausen, 1867 (Hist. of Christian Apologetics in these Latter Days).

[1] Cf. *Brück*, Ch. Hist., p. 782 sq. The sources for this portion of the history may also be found there. (Tr.)

[2] A Short Biography of Father *Theodosius Florentini*, Coire, 1865.

Traces of the spirit of Josephism did not wholly disappear from the theological literature of Germany until after the Church had come triumphant out of the conflict in which she had been engaged, when men rose up, even from among her enemies, whose splendid intellectual gifts and generous impulses enabled them to comprehend and appreciate the truth, and fitted them to defend it with that breadth of view, elevation of sentiment, and persuasive beauty of language which the Spirit of God alone inspires. Among these were the illustrious *converts* of whom mention has already been made.[1] Their theological writings are distinguished by that breadth and dignity of treatment so becoming the most noble of sciences. As *Stolberg* led the way to a more profound study of history, and in particular of Church history, so was *Schlegel* the pioneer of *Catholic journalism* in Germany. He was the founder of the *German Museum*, which was followed by the *Europe*, the *Athenæum*, the *Austrian Observer*, and other journals devoted to the defence of Catholic doctrine and the elucidation of every branch of science, embracing in their scope the treatment of theology, ecclesiastical history, political economy, philosophy, philology, poetry, and the fine arts.[2]

Schlegel, being on terms of intimacy with many of the disciples of what was known as the Romantic School, his conversion to Catholicity, when it took place in 1829, produced a powerful effect on the minds of many of his former friends, and, while it was instrumental in bringing some into the Church, it entirely alienated others. *Adam Müller*, a man of extensive learning, treated politics from a Catholic point of view in the *German State Advertiser* (*Deutsche Staatsanzeiger*), and *Jarcke* and *Phillips* followed him in the same field with equal ability in the *Berlin Political Weekly*.[4] These journals were the forerunners of the *ecclesiastico-political papers*, of which we shall have occasion to speak farther on. These were days when the Catholic Church was misunderstood and her doctrines falsified and misrepresented, and hence there was an urgent need of Catholic apologists to correct slanders and refute false statements. This was ably done by

[1] We may be permitted to quote here the splendid testimony which *Henry Heine* bore to the Catholic Church. "I am too well acquainted with history," says he, "not to be struck with admiration at that gigantic monument known as the Catholic Church. Call her the bastile of the soul, if you like; say, if you will, that she is defended by imbeciles; it is still true that it is not easy to take this bastile, and many a rash assailant will yet perish before her walls. As a thinker and a metaphysician, I have ever been forced to admire the consistency of her dogmas, and even as a poet I feel bound to pay her the same homage."

[2] Cf. *William von Schütz*, Anticelsus, a Quarterly, 1842, nro. 1; *Staudenmaier*, Remembrance of Frederic von Schlegel, Tübingen Quarterly, 1832, pp. 607-650. Schlegel, *Earlier Works*, Vienna, 1822-1826, 10 vols.; then, Lectures on Modern History, Vienna, 1811; Philosophy of History, Vienna, 1829; Philosophy of Life, Vienna, 1827; Philosophy of Language, Vienna, 1830. The last four, and other works, have been translated into English. His posthumous works were published by *Windischmann*, Bonn, 1837, 2 vols. His complete works were published in 15 vols., 1822-1846.

[3] *Adam von Müller*, Complete Works, Munich, 1839 sq.

[4] *Jarcke*, Miscellanea, Munich, 1839 sq., 3 vols. *Phillips*, Miscellany, Ratisbon, 3 vols.

Kastner, Abbot *Preehtl*, *Brenner*, *Geiger*, and others; while *Binterim*, possessing a vast store of historical knowledge, and as zealous as he was learned, laboured for close upon half a century with unflagging energy in the interests of the Church († 1855). Popular expositions of Catholic doctrine were written by *Onymus*, *Ildephonsus Schwarz*, *Sambuga*, *Schwarzhueber*, *Widmer*, and Bishop *Frint;* but none of these attracted so large a share of attention by their writings as Bishop *Sailer*, whose *Fundamental Doctrines of Religion* inspired a respect for Christianity in the minds of university students, and taught them that religion, and religion alone, is capable of raising man to his true dignity. He also translated the *Letters of All Ages*, which contributed powerfully to withdraw many from the seductions of false science, and lead them back to the truth. "He stood like a solitary light-house in the midst of the surging waves of rationalism and unbelief, and to him all those who still believed in Christ and hoped for salvation through Him turned their wistful gaze."[1]

Schnappinger of Freiburg, *Galura*, *Hagel*, and *Waibel* wrote chiefly on *positive theology*, but their works are much inferior to those of *Liebermann*, who has been quite recently followed by *Prunyi*, *Penka*, *Schwetz*, and some others. *Oberthür* gave special prominence to the biblical side of theology;[2] while *Hermes*, taking Stattler as his model, aimed at correcting the influence of Kantism, by constructing dogmatical theology upon a strictly philosophical basis, and showing the close and essential connection between the several dogmas, one by one, and all the rest.[3] *Zimmer*,[4] and in a measure *Seber*[5] also, following in the wake of Hermes, attempted to build a system of theology upon the principles of Schelling's philosophy of identity. *Dobmayer*[6] and *Brenner*[7] took as the basis of their system the idea of the *City of God*, but, failing to give consistency to their plan, they finally abandoned it; whence *Bittner* made another effort to do justice to the subject.[8]

Besides his other valuable contributions to Catholic theology, *Drey* also wrote a masterly apology for Christianity.[9] After the example of Dobmayer, *Francis Baader* treated dogmatical theology from a

[1] *Aichinger*, in his Preface to the Life of John Michael Sailer, Bishop of Ratisbon, Freiburg, 1865.

[2] *Schnappinger*, Doctrina dogmatum eccles. christ. cathol. ad usus academ., Aug. Vind., 1816, 2 T. As to the others, see Thesaurus, &c. *Fr. Liebermann*, Institt. theolog., in several editions, Mentz. *Prunyi*, Theol. dogmatica christiano-catholica. *Penka*, Prælectiones ex theologia dogmat. exaratæ. *Schwetz*, Theologia dogmatica catholica. *Oberthür*, Idea biblica ecclesiæ Dei.

[3] Vide infra § 419,

[4] *Zimmer*, Veritas christ. religionis s. theol. chr. dogm. II. P. Aug. Vindelic., 1789, 1790; Theol. christ. specialis ac theoret., Landish., 1802-1806; Philosophy of Religion, Landshut, 1805.

[5] *Seber*, Religion and Theology, Cologne, 1823.

[6] *Dobmayer*, Systema theolog. cath. opus posthum. cur. *Senestrey*, VIII. T., Solisb., 1807-1819; In compend. redact, ab E. Salomon, 2 T., Solisb., 1813.

[7] Delineation of Theology from "The City of God," Bamberg, 1817-1819, 3 vols, Revised edition, entitled System of Catholic Speculative (?) Theology, Ratisbon, 1838.

[8] *Franc. Bittneri*, Posn. doctoris et professoris theologi de civitate divina commentarii, Mogunt., 1845. (Compend. dogm. complet.)

[9] *Von Drey*, Apology or Scientific Demonstration of the Divinity of Christianity Mentz, 1838, 3 vols.

speculative point of view, but in his philosophical notions he was too close a follower of the theosophic system of Jacob Böhme,[1] and was not unfrequently at variance with the teachings of the Church. His disciple, *Francis Hoffmann*,[2] of Würzburg, though a more orderly and luminous writer than his master, upon many of whose obscure passages he threw a flood of light, is, nevertheless, at times difficult to understand. Of the writers who treated speculative theology, *Günther*,[3] *Papst*,[4] *Veith*[5] of Vienna, *Klee*,[6] *Staudenmaier*,[7] *Kuhn*,[8] *Baltzer*, *Berlage*, *Dieringer*, *Oswald*, *Zukrigl*, and *Denziger* are remarkable for their lucidity and scientific precision. The last-named published a very careful review of the dogmatic decisions of the Church. *Sheeben* gave life and warmth to his treatise on dogmatic theology by introducing into his scholasticism an element of mysticism ;[9] but perhaps no writer of this century did more to rouse men from the indifference into which they were lapsing, in consequence of the negative character of Pro-

[1] See Vol. III., p. 403.

[2] *F. Hoffmann*, Introduction to the Speculative Teachings of Baader, Aschaffenburg, 1836; Introduction to Theology and Philosophy, ibid., 1836; Edition of Baader's Works.

[3] *Anthony Günther* († February 24, 1863), Introduction to Speculative Theology in the form of Letters, Vienna, 1828 and 1846-1848, 2 vols.; Lights North and South on the Horizon of Speculative Theology, Vienna, 1832; The Feast of Peregrinus, Vienna, 1830; Eurystheus and Heracles, Vienna, 1843; Thomas a Scrupulis, Vienna, 1835; The Faces of Janus in Relation to Philosophy and Theology, the joint production of himself and *Papst*, Vienna, 1834: The "Juste-Milieux" of German Philosophy in the Present Age, Vienna, 1838 and 1843; The Last Symbol, 1844; Outlines of Metaphysics, 1848; Lydia, or an Annuary of Philosophy, written conjointly with *Veith*.

[4] *Papst*, Is there a Philosophy of Positive Christianity? Cologne, 1832. Man and His History, Vienna, 1830. On Ecstasy, Cologne, 1833. Adam and Christ.

[5] *Veith*, The "Our Father," or Illustrations of the Lord's Prayer, Vienna, 1831. 3rd ed., 1842; Engl. transl. by *E. Cox*, London, 1849. "Eucharistia," Vienna, 1847. Homilies, 5 vols. (Tr.)

[6] *Klee*, System of Catholic Dogmatics, Bonn, 1831. Dogmatics, Mentz, 1839, 3 vols. History of Dogmas, Mentz, 1837 sq., 2 vols. Outlines of Catholic Morals, posthumous ed., by *Himioben*, Mentz, 1843.

[7] *Staudenmaier* († 1856), Hist. of the Election of Bishops, Tübingen, 1830. The Practical Manifestation of the Gifts of the Spirit (*Tüb. Quart.*, 1828), Tüb., 1835. Scotus Erigena, Frkft., 1833. Encyclopædia of Theological Sciences (Mentz, 1834), 2nd ed., Vol. I., 1840. Universities and the Interior Organization of Scientific Instruction, Freiburg, 1839. Philosophy of Christianity, or Metaphysics of the Holy Scriptures, Giessen, 1840, Vol. I. Genius of Christianity (Mentz, 1835), 7th ed., 1860, 2 vols. Nature of the Cath. Church, Freiburg, 1845. About Religious Pacification in the Future, Freiburg, 1846, 3 pts. Christian Dogmatics, Freiburg, 1844 sq. Religious Mission of the Present Age, Freiburg, 1848. Cfr. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. XII., p. 1151 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 387.

[8] *Kuhn*, Jacobi and the Philosophy of His Age, Mentz, 1834. Catholic Dogmatics, Tübingen, 1846 sq.; 2nd ed., 1859.

[9] *Berlage*, Apologetics of the Church, Münster, 1834. Introduction to and Systematization of Catholic Dogmatics, Münster, 1834, 6 vols. *Dieringer*, Systematism of the Divine Facts of Christianity, 2nd ed., Mentz, 1857. *Manual* of Catholic Dogmatics, 5th ed., Mentz, 1865. *Catechism for the Laity*, Mentz, 1865. *H. Oswald*, Dogmatic Teaching on the Sacraments, 2nd ed., Münster, 1864. (His "Dogmatic Mariology," Lat.: Mariologia Dogmatica, hoc est: Systematica expositio totius doctrinæ de B. Virgine, was, by decree of December 6, 1855, put on the Index. *Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et opus reprobavit.* Index. libror. prohib., p. 239, ed. Mechlin., 1860. (Tr.) *Zukrigl*, Scientific Vindication of the Christian *Dogma of the Trinity*, Vienna, 1846. *Denzinger*, Four Books of Religious Knowledge, Würzburg, 1846, 2 vols., and Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum de rebus fidei et morum, Wirceburgi, ed. IV., 1865; *Schæben*, The Mysteries of the Christian Religion, Freiburg, 1865

testantism, than *John Adam Möhler*,[1] whose *Symbolism*, in which is embodied so extensive a knowledge of ecclesiastical history and patristic science, carried the thoughts of his contemporaries, whether clerical or lay, back to the early ages of the Church, and produced upon their minds a powerful impression in favour of Catholicity. In the hope of making a stand against the growing infidelity of the age, *Reinerding*, *Ehrlich*, *Vosen*, and *Hettinger*[2] published apologetical writings in defence of the doctrines that were most violently assailed. Bishops *Von Ketteler* of Mentz, and *Conrad Martin* of Paderborn, both men of unusual learning and ability, also dissipated many errors in doctrine, and corrected many prejudices against the Church by their apologetical works.[3] It is gratifying to see the zeal and even enthusiasm with which the *history of dogma*, almost totally neglected since the time of Petavius and Thomassin, has been again taken up in these latter days by *Klee*, *Wörter*, *Schwane*, and *Zobl;* and it is equally gratifying to see the evidences of a returning taste for the study of *biblical theology*.[4]

Moral theology has been treated with considerable freedom and some ability by recent authors, and notably by *Geishüttner*, *Reyberger*, *Schenkl*, *Wanker*, and *Riegler*, whose works are infected with the prevailing philosophy of the age, and are philosophical treatises on ethics, rather than expositions of Christian morality. Their works were superseded by *Sailer's Moral Theology* (1817) and *Stapf's Christian Morals*,[5] and these, in turn, as well as those of *Braun* and

[1] *Moehler* († April 12, 1838), *Unity of the Church*, 2nd ed., 1847. *St. Athanasius the Great* and the Church of His Age, Mentz, 2nd ed., 1844. *Symbolism*, or Doctrinal Differences between Protestants and Catholics, Mentz, 1833; 8th ed., 1872; Engl. transl. by J. B. Robertson, New York, 1844. *New Investigations* of the Doctrinal Points controverted between Catholics and Protestants, 2nd ed., Mentz, 1835. *Miscellanea*, published by Doellinger, Ratisbon, 1839, 2 vols. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. VII., p. 159 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 15, p. 166 sq. *Woerner-Gams* (The Life of), John Adam Moehler Ratisbon, 1866.

[2] *Reinerding*, Theologia fundamentalis, Münster, 1864. *Ehrlich*, Fundamental Theology, Prague, 1859 sq. *Vosen*, Christianity and the Protests of its Adversaries against It, 2nd ed., Freiburg, 1864. *Hettinger*, Apologia of Christianity, 4th ed., Freiburg, 1872 (is being transl. into Portuguese). Cfr. *Literary Guide*, No. 32, p. 54 sq.

[3] *Bp. Von Ketteler*, The Rights and Guarantees of the Catholic Church in Germany, 5th ed., 1854; Liberty and Authority of the Church, 7th ed., 1862; The Labour Question and Christianity, 3rd ed., 1864; May a Christian who has Faith be a Freemason? About Religious Instruction in Public Schools; Our Situation in Germany after the War of 1866, 6th ed., 1867. (The True Basis of Religious Pacification, 3rd ed., 1868; The Œcumenical Council and its Influence on Our Age, 5th ed., 1869; The Views of Dr. Falk, Minister of Worship, concerning the Catholic Church, from his Speech of December 10. 1873 (1874). *Bp. Conrad Martin*, Science of Things Divine, being Lectures for the Educated Classes; A Bishop's Word to the Protestants of Germany; Second Work of a Bishop (concerning St. Boniface's Society), &c. (Tr.)

[4] *Klee*, Hist. of Dogmatics, 1837. *Woerter*, The Connection of Free-will with Grace, until the Age of St. Augustine, Freiburg, 1856, 2 vols.; Pelagianism, Freiburg, 1866. *Schwane*, Hist. of Dogmas, Münster, 1862 sq., 2 vols. *Zobl*, Hist. of the Dogmas of the Catholic Church, Innspruck, 1865. Works on biblical theology have been published, above all, by *Bade*, *Koenig*, *Scholz*, and *Simar*. Vide infra, p. 297, n. 1.

[5] *Sailer's* Complete Works, revised and augmented; published by *Widmer*, Sulzbach, 1830-1841, in 40 pts. Cfr. Services rendered by Sailer to the Cause of Catholic Science (*The Catholic*, 1842, September number, pp. 247-264). *Stapf*, Christian Morality, Innspruck, 1841-1842, 4 vols.; Latin, Œniponti, 1841, 1842 (ed. V.)

Vogelsang, which were tainted with the errors of Hermes, by the writings of *Hirscher*,[1] who, from the very outset of his career as a writer, set aside what he considered a corruption of Scholasticism, and confined himself in his *Christian Morals* to a simple and concise exposition of the ethical teaching of the Gospel. This work, which, as it were, opened up a new view of the *Kingdom of God*, was received with universal applause by his contemporaries, whose faith it strengthened and whose charity it purified. Like Möhler, he exercised a marked influence upon the religious and ecclesiastical tendencies of his age and country, and his *Catechisms* and *Socratic Method of Instruction* were potent in giving direction to the religious instruction of youth. The *Christian* tone and *purely etchical* treatment of morality having been thus restored, quite a number of works on the science appeared in rapid succession from the pens of *Probst* (1848), *Martin*, *Rietter* (1848 and 1867), *Werner* (1850 and 1863), *Fuchs* (1851), *Elger* (1852), *Jocham* (1852), *Dieckhoof* (1853), *Bittner*, *Hähnlein* (1855), *Simar* (1866), *Ernst Müller*,[2] *Kössing* (1868), *Linsenmann*, and *Pruner*, some of whom gave a more positive character to the subject, while others revived the scholastic method, and overcharged their writings with casuistry and canon law.[3]

A great deal has also been done in these latter days to advance the study of *Scripture* and its kindred branches. The work accomplished in this field by Professor *Jahn*[4] of Vienna and Professor *Hug* of Freiburg († 1846), the latter a man of exceptionally fine mental endowments, but daring in his speculations, has received and largely merited the grateful recognition of the learned world. They were followed by *Feilmoser*,[5] *Unterkircher*,[6] *Herbst*, *Welte*,[7] *Movers*, *Scholz* of Bonn, *Friedlieb*, *Haneberg*, *Reusch*, *Danko*, *Scholz* of Breslau, *Maier* and *Reithmayr*, *Langen*,[8] *Lutterbeck*,[9] and others. *Jahn*, *Arigler*, *Gerhauser*, *Alber*, *Unterkircher*, *Ranolder*, *Löhnis*, *Schmitter*, *Lomb*,

[1] *Hirscher* († September 4, 1865), Connection of the Gospel with Modern Scholastic Theology, Tübingen, 1823. Reflections on the Lenten *Gospels* and those of the Ecclesiastical Year (in many editions); Catechetics, 4th ed., Tübingen, 1840; Christian Morality, Tübingen, 1835 sq., 3 vols. (in several editions); Life of Jesus; Large and Small Catechism; Answers to the Great Religious Questions of the Day, Freiburg, 1846 sq.; Life of Mary; Principal Articles of the Catholic Faith; Reflections on the Epistles of the Sundays; His Apprehensions as to the Efficiency of Our Religious Instruction, Freiburg, 1863; On Illusions, Freiburg, 1865; His Smaller Writings, Freiburg, 1808. Cf. *Woerter*, Panegyric of John Baptist Hirscher, Freiburg, 1866.

[2] Theologia Moralis, Viennæ, 1868, 1869. [3] Cf. Literary Guide, nros. 56-59, year 1867.

[4] Introduction to the Old Testament, Biblical Archæology.

[5] Introduction to the New Testament. [6] Introductio in N. Test.

[7] Introduction to the Old Testament.

[8] *Scholz*, Introd. to the Books of the O. and of the N. T., Cologne, 1845 sq.: Biblical Archæology, Bonn, 1834; Novum Testamentum græce, Lips., 1830 sq., 2 T. *Haneberg*, Essay of a Hist. of Biblical Revelation, being an Introduction to the Books of the Old and of the New Testament, 1850; 3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1863. The Arabic Translations of the Psalms by Saadia Reviewed, 1840; Religious Antiquities, 1842; 2nd ed., 1866. *Messmer*, Hist. of the Revelation, Freiburg, 1857, 2 vols. *Reusch*, Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament, Freiburg, 1859; 4th ed., 1870. *Danko*, Historia revelationis div. Vet. et Nov. Testam., Viennæ, 1862-1867, 3 T. *Scholz*, Manual of the Old Testament Theology, Ratisbon, 1861, 2 vols.

[9] *Lutterbeck*, Doctrinal System of the N. T., Mentz, 1852, 2 vols.

Güntner, *Kohlgruber*, and *Wilke*, a convert, wrote on hermeneutics, the last-named being also the author of the *Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum*. Popular expositions of the New Testament were written by *Schnappinger*, *Kistemaker*, and *Massl*; and of the entire Bible by *Braun*, *Brentano*, *Dereser-Scholz*, *Allioli*, and conjointly by *Loch* and *Reischl*. Commentaries aiming at giving a deeper view of the sense of the Books of the Old and New Testaments were written by *Gügler*, *Leopold Schmid*, *Welte*, *Schegg*, *Reinke*, *Bade*, *König*, *Thalhofer*, *Reusch*, *Klee*, *Mack*, *Stengel*, *Adalbert Maier* of Freiburg, *Maier* of Bamberg, *Aberle* and *Himpel* of Tübingen, *Windischmann*, *Reithmayr*, *Stern*, *Bisping*, *Arnoldi*, *Langen*, *Grimm*, *Simar*, and *Rohling*.[1]

The objections drawn from the natural sciences against the *history of the creation*, as related in the Book of Genesis, have been again and again ably refuted or reconciled with the letter of the Sacred Text by *Reusch*, *Bosizio*, *Veith*, *Baltzer*, and *Michelis*.[2]

Most of the authors who have written on Church history have been already named in the Introduction, but the following may be added to the list as deserving special praise for their excellent monographs, viz.: *Döllinger*, *Floss*, *Hefele*, *Scharpff*, *Ginzel*, *Kunstmann*, *Düx*, *Schwab*, *Gfrörer*, *Alfred von Reumont*, *Von Hübner*, *Charles Werner*, the most prolific of modern theological writers; *Damberger*, *Marx*, *Hergenröther*, *Reinkens*, *Gams*, *Hagemann*, *Friedrich*, *Funk*, *Hülskamp*, *Rump*, and others. In canon law, works have been produced by *Sauter*, *Frey*,

[1] *Gügler*, Explanation of the Holy Scriptures through Themselves, Lucerne, 1817 sq., 2 vols. *Schmid*, Interpretation of Genesis, Münster, 1834, 1835. *Welte*, The Book of Job. *Schegg*, Explanation of the Psalms of Isaias, of the Minor Prophets, and of the Gospels. *Reinke*, De Messiæ expiatore, passuro et morituro; Prophecy concerning the B. Virgin and Emmanuel; Jacob's Blessing; Brief Explanation of the O. T.; Messianic Psalms; Greater and Minor Prophets, &c. *Bade*, Christology of the O. T., Münster, 2 vols. *Koenig*, Theology of the Psalms, Freiburg, 1857. The Idea of Immortality in the Book of Job, Freiburg, 1855. Old Testament Royalty, Freiburg, 1863. About Walafried Strabo (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. III.) *Thalhofer*, Exposition of the Psalms, Ratisbon, 1857, and frequently. *Reusch*, Interpretation of the Books of Baruch and Tobias, Freiburg, 1853 sq. *Klee*, Interpretation of the Gospel of St. John and of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. *Mack*, Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle, Tuebingen, 1836. *Stengel*, Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, publ. by *Beck*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1836. *Adalbert Maier*, Introduction to the Books of the N. T., Freiburg, 1852; Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Freiburg, 1843; On the Epistle to the Romans, 1847; On the First and Second to the Corinthians; On the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christology of the New Testament, 1871. *Reithmayr*, (of Munich), Introd. to the Canonical Books of the N. T., Ratisbon, 1852. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1845; to the Galatians, 1865. *Windischmann*, Explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians, Mentz, 1843. *Stern*, Commentary on the Apocalypse, Schaffhausen, 1854. *Bisping*, Manual of Exegetics for the Epistles of the Apostle Paul; the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, 4 vols., to the Catholic Epistles, partly in new editions, Münster, 1855 sq. *Arnoldi*, Commentary on St. Matthew, Treves, 1856. *Langen*, The Last Days of Jesus, being a Biblico-Historical Essay, Freiburg, 1864; The Condition of the Jews in Palestine during the Times of Jesus Christ, Freiburg, 1866. *Grimm*, Harmony of the Four Gospels, Ratisbon, 1868; The Samaritans, &c., Munich, 1854. *Simar*, The Theology of St. Paul, Freiburg, 1864.

[2] **Reusch*, The Holy Bible and Nature, 2nd ed., Freiburg, 1866. *Bosizio*, Hexahemeron and Geology, Mentz, 1865. *Veith*, The Beginnings of Mankind, Vienna, 1865. *Baltzer*, The Mosaic Account of Creation, Lps., 1866 sq. *Michelis*, in the periodical "Nature and Revelation"

Schenkl, *Pelka*, *Walter*, *Von Droste*, *Cherier*, *Müller*, *Phillips*, *Permaneder*, *Buss*, *Gitzler*, *Beidtel*, *Pachmann*, *Rosshirt*, *Seitz*, *Von Moy* and *Vering*, *Maassen*, *Hüffer*, *Schulte*, *Kober*, *Schöpf*, and *Kunstmann*, *Sentis*, and finally *Gerlach*.

The attention that has recently been given to the study of *Patrology*, or the history of Christian literature, has been very beneficial in many ways to Catholic theology. The first impulse to this branch of ecclesiastical science was given by *Möhler*.[1] He was followed by *Winter*, *Wiest*, *Busse*, *Goldwitzer*, *Locherer*, and *Annegarn*, whose works on patrology are of comparatively small value; they, however, led the way for abler men in the same field, among whom may be mentioned *Permaneder* and *Fessler*, who wrote in Latin, and *Deutinger*, *Magon*, and *Alzog*,[2] who wrote in German. Valuable contributions were made to *Syriac* literature by *Pius Zingerle*, O.S.B., and *Bickell*

The beginning made by Austrian scholars on *Pastoral Theology* during the preceding Epoch bore abundant fruit in the present. *Sailer*, the first author of considerable merit in this branch, was followed in rapid succession by *Schwarzel*, *Powondra*, *Reichenberger*, *Hinterberger*, *Zenner*, *Gollowitz*, *Brockmann*, *Herzog*, *Widmer*, *Haiker*, *Zwickenpflug* and *Amberger*, *Pohl* of Breslau, *Kerschbaumer* of St. Pölten, *Schüch* of Kremsmünster, and *Benger* and *Gassner*. *Homiletics* and *catechetics* were also treated as specialties by many writers;[3] the former by *Hirscher*, *Müller*, *Stolz*, *Schuster*, *Deharbe-Wilmers*, *Jacob Schmitt*, and others; and the latter by *Zarbl*, *Laberentz*, *Fluck*, etc.; while *Schmid*, *Lüft*, *Fluck*, *Kössing*, *and Probst* wrote on *Liturgy*.

The vital importance attached to the religious instruction of the people during these latter years seems to be one of the distinctive characteristics of modern times, and to be appreciated equally by clergymen and laymen. Acting under the advice of *Sailer*, *Bernard Overberg* of Münster, a priest of great simplicity of life and dignity of manners, drew out in writing a plan for a model parish-school; but he did not stop here; he at once opened and conducted a school such as he had designed, and was gratified, after much labour and disinterested self-sacrifice, at seeing the scheme crowned with complete success.[4] Similar experiments were tried, but with less success, by *Braun* in Bavaria, by *Werkmeister* in Würtemberg, and by *Demeter* in Baden.

Works on *pedagogics* were written by *Stapf*, *Milde*, *Hergenröther*, *Barthel*, and *Dursch*, that of the last-named being especially good. But the most eminent writer in this branch of ecclesiastical science

[1] Moehler's Patrology, published by *Reithmayr*, Vol. I., Ratisbon, 1840.

[2] *Permaneder*, Bibliotheca patristica, Landishuti, 1841 sq., 3 T. (the first three centuries). *Fessler*, Institutiones Patrologiæ, Œniponte, 1850, 1851, 2 T. (to Pope Gregory the Great, A. D. 604). *Deutinger*, Genius of Christian Tradition, Ratisbon, 1830 sq., 2 vols. *Alzog*, Institutes of Patrology, Freiburg; 1st ed., 1866; 2nd ed., 1869; 3rd ed., 1876; there are, besides, several editions in French.

[3] *Graf*, A Critical *Exposition of the Present* Condition of *Practical Divinity*, Tuebingen, 1841.

[4] He died November 9, 1826.

was *Kellner*, First Counsellor of State and Commissioner of Education, whose writings have done a vast deal of good.[1] Besides the praiseworthy and meritorious efforts of *Giles Jais* and *Christopher Schmid* to provide religious instruction for old and young, *Alban Stolz* and *Conrad von Bolanden*, of the diocese of Spire, have achieved eminent success in the same field, and, as writers of religious tales and other works of a similar drift, have never been equalled.[2] *The Encyclopædia of Systematic Education and Instruction*, according to the Principles of Catholic Teaching, edited by the parish priests, *Dr. Rolfus* of Baden, and *Fr. Pfister* of Würtemberg, was the outcome and product of these labours.[3] Important services to Catholic popular education were rendered by the Congregation of the *Mechitarists*, founded at Vienna, *for the diffusion of Catholic literature;* by the *Library Association of Bavaria;* but, above all, by the *Association of St. Charles Borromeo*, at Bonn. *Silbert* of Vienna, a man of fine literary tastes, aided in the same work by his admirable translations of the best ascetical writings, both ancient and modern. Translations of similar works were published and distributed among the people in Bohemia, and at Münster, Aix-la-Chapelle, Ratisbon, Cologne, Schaffhausen, and Mentz, *Ludwig Clarus* (Völk), a convert, being especially distinguished for ease and grace as a translator. Several *poems*, for the most part breathing a true Catholic spirit, were also written; many of the old hymns of the Church cleverly translated; graphic sketches published of those grand old characters of former ages, whose joy it was to walk in the light of God's countenance and to die in the sweetness of his peace; and tales of charming simplicity and winning interest composed for children by men and women whose hearts were as innocent as the hearts of those for whom they wrote. Of these writers it will be sufficient to instance the following: *Frederic Schlegel*, *Wessenberg*, *Clement Bretnano*, *Schlosser*, *Königsfeld*, *Simrock*, *Diepenbrock*, *Ed. von Schenk*, *Von Eichendorf*, *Jean Bapt. Rousseau*, *Guido Görres*, *Count Pocci*, *Edw. Vogt*, *Beda Weber*, *Pius Zingerle*, *Ladislaus Pyrker*, *Christopher Schmid*, *Gallus Morel*, *Oskar von Redwitz*, *Father Zeil*, *Pape*, *Gedeon von der Heide*, *Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn*, *Annette von Droste-Hülshoff*, and *Emily Ringseis*. There were also many able Catholic representatives

[1] *B. Overberg*, Method of Proper Instruction (1793), 6th ed., Münster, 1825. Hist. of the Old and of the New Testament, 2 vols; Manual of Religion, 2 vols.; Large and Small Catechism (Complete ed. of Pedagogical Works, Münster, 1825-1833, 6 vols.) Cfr. the Life and Work of *B. Overberg*, Delineated by One of His Relatives, Münster, 1829. *Krabbe*, Life of *Bernard Overberg*, Münster, 1835. *Kellner*, National Education (*Volksschulkunde*), 5th ed., Essen, 1862; Sketches and Portraits drawn from the History of Education, ibid., 1862, 3 vols. German Reader and Instructor (*Deutsches Lese-und Bildungsbuch*), 3rd ed., Freiburg, 1864, etc.

[2] *Almanac* for Time and Eternity (since 1843); *Legend* (since 1853); *Greek* (*Spanisches*) to the Educated Classes. *A Visit* to Shem, Cham, and Japhet; St. Elizabeth; The Conflict of My Soul. *Conrad von Bolanden*, Complete Works, People's edition, Ratisbon, 1872.

[3] Mentz, 2nd ed., 1872 sq., in 4 vols.

among the historians of *literature*,[1] *politics*,[2] and *Christian art*. The scope of Catholic literature has been widened by recent works on *ecclesiastical statistics*, for which the Catholic world owes a debt of gratitude to Father Charles of St. Aloysius, Schulte, Neher, and Gams.

The literary and scientific activity, of which we have been giving instances, was largely due to the *Catholic periodical literature of Germany*,[3] to which a powerful impulse was given above fifty years ago by *Frederic Schlegel*. There were many Catholic periodicals, some of course of inferior merit, but the two that have exercised the widest and deepest influence on Catholics and Protestants alike were, first, *The Theological Quarterly of Tübingen*, founded in 1819, which, particularly while it was partially under the editorial management of *Möhler* (after 1828), gave ample proof that Catholicity, being founded on the unchangeable principles of truth, could hold its own, not only in the practical affairs of life, but against the most searching investigations of science; and, second, *The Catholic*, founded in 1821, which, loyal to its motto, *Christianus mihi nomen, Catholicus cognomen*, stirred up the consciences of Catholics, and taught them to set a proper value upon their dignity, at a season when the spirit of indifference was more generally diffused than in any former age; when Catholic doctrine seemed fading or already effaced from the minds of men; and when the negations of Protestantism and rationalistic philosophy appeared to have become everywhere triumphant. Since 1859, *The Catholic*, under the editorial management of *Heinrich* and *Moufang*, has been exclusively devoted to *Catholic science* and ecclesiastical life, its speciality being mediæval theology. These two periodicals were followed by several others, which may be classified according to their prevalent tone as follows: 1. The *Scientific*, or those whose drift was similar to that of *The Tübingen Quarterly*, including *The New Theological Journal* of Vienna, edited, until 1840, by *Pletz; Hug's Gazette*, in the interest of the clergy of the Archdiocese of Freiburg, founded in 1828; *The Journal of Catholic Theology and Philosophy*, founded in 1833, and edited by the disciples of Hermes; *The Annals of Christian Theology and Philosophy*, founded in 1834, and published at Giessen; *The Theological Journal* of Freiburg, founded in 1839; *The Archives of Theological Literature*, founded in 1842, and published at Munich; *The Catholic Review of Science and Arts*, founded by *Dieringer; The Organ of Christian Art*, edited by *Baudri* of Cologne; *Church Decoration*, edited by *Laib* and *Schwartz*, of Stuttgart; *The Journal of Canon Law and Pastoral Theology*, edited by *Dr. Seitz; Nature and Revelation*, founded in 1855, with a view to harmonize the study of nature and the dogmas of faith; *The Archives of Catholic Canon Law*, founded in 1857, and edited by *Moy* and *Vering;* and, after some of

[1] By Von Eichendorff and Lindemann.
[2] See Vol. I., p. 21, note 2; and Vol. III., p. 36, note 1.
[3] Cf. *The Catholic*, 1843, January nro., pp. 1-17.

the above had been discontinued, the following were started in their room: *The Catholic Literary Journal* of Vienna, founded in 1854; *The Literary Guide*, founded in 1862, and edited by *Hülskamp* and *Rump* of Münster, its aim being to review the literature of Germany and other countries, to give critiques and notices of books and other publications, and to furnish such information concerning literary subjects and literary men as might be acceptable to its readers; *The Literary and Theological Journal of Criticism*, founded in 1866, and edited by *Reusch* of Bonn, which, in the early days of its existence, counted among its contributors some of the best talent of Germany, but during the Vatican Council drifted into the vagaries of the "Old Catholics;" and the *Historico-political Papers*, founded in 1838, and published at Munich, numbering among its corps of writers many men of great learning and fine mental endowments, who did much to give a Catholic tone to politics, religious life, science, and art; refuted the misrepresentations of Protestant historians; and combated the erroneous political theories of modern times, particularly the perilous doctrines of Liberalism. Works of a similar character appearing in foreign countries were translated and published by *Dr. Huttler* of Augsburg, in *The Catholic Studies*, founded in 1865, and embracing in the scope of its subjects, religion, history, science, art, and social politics.

2. Periodicals having special reference to *pastoral ministrations*, as, for example, *The Monthly Review of Practical Theology*, published at Linz, and which, owing to its *purely practical character*, was eminently popular, there being four editions of it published during the most successful period of its existence; *The Pastoral Archives of Constance;* the *Athanasia*, edited by Benkert; *The Pastor*, edited by Zarbl; *The Archives of Pastoral Conferences* held in the diocese of Augsburg, founded in 1848, and edited by *Merkle*, and the Pastoral Papers of *Munich*, *Cologne*, *Münster*, *Eichstädt*, and *Paderborn*.

3. *Dailies* and *Weeklies*, specially devoted to the interests of the clergy, as, for instance, *The Friend of Religion; Sion; The Catholic Journals* of Frankfort, Passau, and Switzerland; *The Catholic Ecclesiastical Gazette* of Vienna;[1] *The Church Journal* of Silesia; *The South German*, subsequently of Freiburg; *The Rhenish Ecclesiastical Papers*, and those of *Mentz*, *Münster*, *Munich*, Hildesheim, Salzburg, Linz, and other cities. *The Augsburg Post-Gazette* and *several* other papers, Catholic in tone, have sprung up since 1844, of which it will be sufficient to instance *The South German Gazette; The Messenger of the People*, published at Munich; *The Journal of Mentz; The People's Magazine*, subsequently called the *Deutschland*, then *The Cologne Gazette*, and now *The People's Gazette; The People's Paper*, published at Stuttgart; *The Westphalia Mercury; The Echo of the Present*, published at Aix-la-Chapelle; *The Friend of the People*, published at Vienna; *The Observer*, published at Baden; *The Germania*,

[1] Edited by *Dr. Sebastian Brunner.*

published at Berlin; and *The Imperial Gazette*, published at Bonn, beside quite a number of *illustrated* weeklies.

The best productions of the editors of these papers and periodicals were collected and published in the *Ecclesiastical Cyclopædias* of Wetzer and Wette and of Aschbach, the former issued at *Freiburg* and the latter at *Frankfort*.

§ 420. *Activity of the Catholics of Germany in the Field of Speculative Theology.*

† *Aloysius Schmid*, Activity displayed by Catholics in the Domain of Science, Munich, 1862. Cf. *Chas. Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol., pp. 405 sq.

The impulse given to the study of *philosophy* by recent events and the desire to harmonize its principles and deductions with the teachings of faith led to very important results. After it had been found impossible to reconcile the philosophy of either Kant, Fichte, Schelling, or Hegel with the system of Catholic theology, various attempts were made, first by Frederic Schlegel, Molitor,[1] and Baader, and subsequently by other writers, to build up a complete system of Christian philosophy, which, while leaving faith intact, would serve as a weapon of defence to ward off the numerous attacks made upon it. Of those who laboured to realize this idea it will be enough to quote names of *Hermes*, Esser, Elvenich, Von Droste, Braun, Achterfeld, and Baltzer representing one school; and of *Günther*, Papst, Veith, Hock, and Knoodt, representing another. Many of the questions belonging to speculative theology and philosophy were also ably discussed by *Sengler* of Freiburg, Schmitt of Bamberg, Leopold Schmid of Giessen, *Deutinger* of Munich, Volkmuth, Massman, Schenach, *Katzenberger* of Bamberg, *Denzinger* and *Francis Brentano* of Würzburg, Huber, Oischinger, Suing, Uschold, Becker, Kaulich, *Hagemann* of Münster, *Charles Werner*, and others. When *Frohschammer*, a professor at Munich, began to defend philosophical propositions at variance with the teachings of the Catholic faith, *Clemens* and *Stöckl* of Münster, Plassman of Paderborn, Von *Schäzler*, *Scheeben*, and other writers for *The Catholic* of Mentz, entered the field against him, and following in the wake of Father *Kleutgen*, *S.J.*, of Rome, earnestly advocated a return to the teachings of the Schoolmen, and in particular to the theology of St. Thomas and the philosophy of Aristotle. On the other hand, *Michelis*, of Braunsberg, insisted with equal earnestness on the necessity of correctly understanding and properly applying to theology the *original* principles of the philosophy of Plato.[2]

We will here dwell a little in detail upon these three movements,

[1] *Molitor*, Philosophy of History, or Tradition, Frankfort and Münster, 1828 sq., 3 pts.

[2] *P. Kleutgen*, *S.J.*, The Theology of Past Ages, Münster, 1853 sq., 3 vols.; Philosophy of Past Ages, ibid., 1860 sq., 2 vols. Against this: *Michelis*, Observations on the Philosophy of Past Ages, Defended by Father Kleutgen, Freiburg, 1865. The *same*, The Philosophy of Plato in its Intimate Connection with Revealed Truth, Münster, 1859, 2 pts. *Dr. Becker*, The Philosophical System of Plato in its Relation to Christian Dogma, taken from quite a different point of view of the subject, Freiburg, 1862.

because of their importance, and first upon that of which *Hermes*, professor at Münster, and subsequently at Bonn, was the leader.

George Hermes died at Bonn, March 26, 1831. The following words, inscribed on his tomb, unlike most epitaphs, have the merit of being truthful: "From his earliest youth this truly great man sacrificed all the pleasures of life to his thirst for knowledge of sacred things and to his zeal for the Christian religion; and no master of this or any other age has inspired in his pupils feelings of such tender attachment and loyal devotion." And, we may add, never has master guided pupils, whether in their studies or in their daily conduct, with greater wisdom and prudence. Fully believing in his own, he was impatient and even intolerant of all other systems, and this spirit of exclusiveness interfered with his breadth of view,[1] incapacitating him to judge of the doctrines of the Church as a whole and in their multitudinous relations, and leading both him and his disciples unconsciously to introduce a rationalistic and Pelagian element into their treatment. His system was in consequence condemned at Rome, September 26, 1835, and the *justice*[2] of the judgment was plainly established when Professor *Baltzer*, probably the most vigorous of all his disciples, openly advocated Semi-Rationalism and Semi-Pelagianism in his exposition of Hermesianism.[3] After the publication of the brief of condemnation, the more obstinate of his disciples, refusing to yield, defended themselves, like the *Jansenists* in a former age,[4] by declaring that the doctrines condemned by the Holy Father had not been taught by Hermes, and were not to be found in his writings. Two of the more prominent of these, Professors *Elvenich* of Breslau, and *Braun* of Bonn, after some preliminary correspondence with the Holy See, offered to appear personally and prove that their statement was correct; but Rome peremptorily declined to enter upon so useless a discussion, broke off all negotiations, and demanded an unqualified submission to the brief of condemnation.[5] Several of

[1] Cfr. *Esser*, Recollections of George Hermes, Cologne, 1832, pp. 135, 136. Works of Hermes, On the *Intrinsic* Truth of Christianity, Münster, 1805; *Philosophical* Introduction to Catholic Theology, Münster, 1819; *Positive* Introduction, ibid., 1829; *Catholic Dogmatics*, published by *Achterfeld*, Münster, 1831 sq., 3 vols.

[2] *Pro memoria*, in the Affair of Hermesianism, Mentz, 1837. (*Meckel*), The Doctrines of Hermes with Respect to their Condemnation by the Pope, Mentz, 1837. *Berlage*, Introduction to Catholic Dogmatics viewed in the light of the Papal Condemnation of the Doctrine of Hermes, Münster, 1839. A pretty full statement of this controversy is found in *Niedner*, Philosophiæ Hermesii Bonnensis novar. rer. in theol. exordii explicatio et existimatio, Lps., 1839. *Niedner* arrives at the following conclusion "Hermes is far from having strengthened the basis of revelation by his philosophy.": The first charge against Hermes (by *Windischmann*) in "*The Catholic*," 1825, October number, p. 1 sq., and, especially, November number, p. 156 sq. The Replies (by *Droste?*) in Smets' Catholic Monthly, spec. ed., Cologne, 1825, Vol. I., p. 81 sq.; Vol. II., pp. 101-107. Cfr. *Kreuzhage*, The Connection of the Hermesian System with Christian Science, Münster, 1838, note 1, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 658 sq. *Myletor*, Hermesianism reviewed from its Dogmatical Point of View, Ratisbon, 1845.

[3] *Baltzer*, Essay in Aid of an Impartial Judgment on Catholicism and Protestantism, 2nd number, pp. 156 and 264 in the notes, Breslau, 1840.

[4] See § 365.

[5] *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Acta Romana, Lips., 1838. Cfr. therewith *Hist.* and *Polit Papers*, Vol. II., pp. 526-543. *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Meletemata theologica, Lps., 1838. German revised edition, "Theologische Studien mit Anmerkungen," Cologne, 1839.

the professors at the Seminary of Treves, favourable to the teachings of Hermes, now signified their readiness to cheerfully submit, without qualification, to the decree of the Holy See, and, in consequence, drew up an act of renunciation, which they placed in the hands of their bishop, at the same time forwarding a copy to the Holy Father. To the more loyal of the followers of Hermes this act gave offence, and produced a temporary rupture between the Rhenish clergy and those of Westphalia.

While Hermes gave too great importance to the office of the reason in arriving at the knowledge of revealed truth, Professor *Bautain*, of Strasburg, went to the other extreme, denying the legitimate functions of the human intellect as an instrument of such knowledge. His bishop condemned his teaching as dangerous, and the Holy See fully sustained the decision.[1]

By Professor *Braun*, of Bonn, this judgment was interpreted as an approval of the teachings of Hermes, as if there could be no *via media* between Bautainism and Hermesianism. When Braun a his friends persisted in their errors, a formal complaint was made against them at Rome, and sustained by the Holy See.[2] Bautain and his followers, after some previous discussion at Rome, humbly and unreservedly acquiesced in the judgment of the Holy Father.[3] Professors *Achterfeld* and *Braun*, obstinately refusing to submit to the Papal Brief condemning the writings of Hermes, were declared by the Coadjutor-Archbishop of Cologne disqualified to hold their chairs in the University, and were accordingly retired by the Government, in 1844, but left to the enjoyment of their full salaries.[4] Being sincerely attached to the Church, they could not bring themselves to break openly with her Head, *whom they had ever recognized both by deed and word, as the true successor to St. Peter.* After having sent them an encyclical letter, pointing out the errors of Hermes, and summoning them in a spirit of paternal kindness to submit to the judgment of the Holy See, which entirely failed of its purpose, Pius IX. renewed the censure passed upon Hermesianism by Gregory XVI.[5]

A similar controversy arose in 1850 concerning *Anthony Günther*, a secular priest of Vienna, and his disciples, who were charged with unduly exaggerating the claims of science and correspondingly

[1] Rapport à Mgr. l'évêque de Strasbourg, sur les écrits de M. l'abbé Bautain, Paris, 1838. *Moehler*, A Letter Missive to M. *Bautain*, in his Complete Works, Vol. II., pp. 141-164. Cfr. A Brief Review of M. *Bautain's* Theory (in *The Catholic*, 1835, Vol. 57, p. 125 sq., p. 286 sq.), and many articles in the *Bonn Review*.

[2] † *Braun*, The Tenets of Hermesianism, &c., Bonn, 1835. Laocoön, or Hermes and Perrone, by Daniel Bernhardi (*Braun*), Cologne, 1840. This work in Latin: Laocoon sive Hermesius et Perronius. Latine conversus et variis additamentis auctus, Bonnæ, 1842.

[3] *The Catholic*, 1841, Suppl. to February number. *Tübingen Quart.*, 1841, p. 371 sq.

[4] The explanations given by Professors Braun and Achterfeld of the grounds of their refusal to submit to the Pope's decision are found in the *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 4, and some articles of *The Catholic* of 1844, nros. 1, 4, and 16.

[5] Cfr. *The Catholic*, 1847, September number. *Bonn Review* of Philos. and Theol., ed. by Achterfeld and Braun, nro. 64.

ignoring those of the authority of the Church. After an animated controversy, both parties laid the points at issue before the Holy See for decision.[1] By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, dated January 8, 1857, Günther's entire works were condemned, and to the great joy of the Holy Father, the humble priest promptly and cheerfully submitted to the decision. He died February 24, 1863. It cannot, however, be denied that Günther, like Baader, rendered important services to Catholic science; and being a more skilful and acute dialectician than the latter, he was better able to make a successful stand against Protestant philosophy, the more so in that he was firmly persuaded that the principles underlying his philosophical system were grounded on the unalterable teachings of Catholic theology. Like Hermes, he manifested a tendency to a *rationalistic* bias of thought, and, failing to clearly apprehend and set forth the distinction between formalism and realism in logic, he arrived at incorrect conclusions concerning the *Trinity* and erroneous *views on creation*. He also failed to properly appreciate the relation of empiricism to idealism, of faith to science, and of *spirit to matter*, and, by consequence, of the *divine to the human nature in Christ*.[2] To him, however, above all others, in modern times, is due the credit of having revived the study of the science of theology in Austria.

Frohschammer, a professor at Munich, and a prolific writer, advanced some startling propositions on the origin of the soul, advocating the theory of *traducianism*, which he carried to the extreme of *generationism*. He also pleaded in strong and unmistakable language for the complete and absolute separation of philosophy from theology.

[1] Arguments for and against Günther, in the *Old* and in the *New Sion;* in the *Augsburg Post-Gazette;* in the *Würzburg Catholic Weekly*. *Mattes*, Günther and His Points of Approach to the New School of Theology (*Tübingen Quart.*, 1844, 3rd nro., pp. 347-416). *Clemens*, The Speculative Theology of Günther and the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, Cologne, 1853. *Baltzer*, New Theological Letters, addressed to Dr. Anthony Günther, Breslau, 1853, two series. *Knoodt*, Günther and Clemens, Vienna, 1853. *Clemens*, Manifest Opposition of Günther's Speculation to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, by Professor *Knoodt*, Cologne, 1853. *Oischinger*, The Philosophy of Günther, Schaffhausen, 1852. *Michelis*, The Philosophy of Günther Reviewed, Münster, 1854. *Zukrigl*, Critical Investigation into the Essence of the Rational Spirit and the Psycho-Corporeal Nature of Man, Ratisbon, 1854. *Hitzfelder*, The Latest Discussions on the Speculative Theology of Dr. *A. Günther* and of His School (*Tüb. Quart.*, 1851, nro. 1). The *same*, The Theology and Polemics of the Partisans of Günther (*Tüb. Quart.*, 1854, nro. 4). Günther's Reply thereto, in the last volume of *Lydia*, A.D., 1854. Anthony Günther and the Discussions on His Philosophy (by a Catholic divine), in the *Augsb. Univ. Gazette*, Suppl. to nros. 105, 106, 107, of 1863. The *American Cyclop.* says: "A. Günther was eminent as a writer on philosophical subjects. But while he combated the views of Hegel and Herbart, and endeavoured to reconcile the doctrines of the Catholic Church with the teachings of modern philosophy, he unjustly blamed the Fathers of the Church and the scholastics for having employed pagan conceptions in seeking to impress the truths of religion." All his works, as given above, at p. 294, abstruse as are their contents, were in a Latin translation (by *Flir*), after *nine* years' close examination, placed on the *Index Expurgatorius* (January 8, 1857). *Auctor*, so says the Index, at p. 146, *datis literis ad SS. D. N. Pium, P.P. IX. sub die* 10 *Febr.* (1857), *ingenue, religiose ac laudabiliter se subjecit.* (Tr.)

[2] See the Papal Brief, which is found in the work entitled "Pius IX. as Pope and as King," p. 117

His writings were condemned by the Holy See, December 11, 1862.[1] The writings of two other professors at the University of Munich, *Huber* and *Pichler*, were also condemned; those of the former because their author had advanced certain errors concerning *Scotus Erigena;* and those of the latter, because they contained a defence of the Greek Schism at variance with historical facts and detrimental to the Church of Rome, including strictures on the authority of the *Sacred Congregation of the Index* and the binding force of its decrees.[2] Many theologians, believing that the origin of these errors lay in the abandonment of the old scholastic methods,[3] formed a new school, known as Neo-Scholasticism, and, forgetful of the Catholic maxim—*In dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*—declaimed intemperately against the advocates of modern speculative methods, even going the length of questioning their loyalty to the Church. This conduct was all the more reprehensible, in that the advocates of the new scientific methods had not manifested the least hostility to the Schoolmen; on the contrary, they bore willing witness to their loftiness of thought and their activity, the impulse they had given to the human mind, and the services they had rendered to science. Nay, more, *Charles Werner*, one of their number, made a special study of the works of *St. Thomas* and *Suarez*, two of the most eminent of the Schoolmen, giving a wonderfully vivid and truthful picture of their lives, their labours, and their influence. But they did protest against pretensions like those set forth in the work of *Plassmann*,[4] by which an attempt is made to restrict modern science to methods which have been long since given up in the study of theology and philosophy, as if the example of *St. Thomas* himself, who was so tolerant of the opinions of others, were not a solemn warning against a proceeding so unreasonable. To discard modern methods, better adapted to the present development of science, and to again introduce into schools the old peripatetic and scholastic methods, would be even to disregard the injunction contained in the words of St. Matthew, ix. 16. After some desultory skirmishing, directed against the Neo-Scholastics, chiefly by *Mattes*,[5] *Oischinger*, and

[1] *Frohschammer*, On the Origin of the Human Soul, Munich, 1854; Introduction to Philosophy, *ibid.*, 1858; On the Liberty of Science, several articles in the periodical "*Athenæum;*" On the Rights of Philosophy and Scholasticism, Munich, 1863. Cfr. *Dr. Becker*, The Liberty and the Rights of the New Philosophy, by Frohschammer, reviewed, Spire, 1863; and in *The Catholic* of 1863, Vol. I., pp. 385-407; and Vol. II.: "*Frohschammer* and the Apostolic See," three articles. See also *Dr. O. A. Brownson's* Quarterly Review, year 1863.

[2] The Roman Congregation of the Index and Its Powers, Munich, 1863. In an opposite spirit: "Authorization, Objects, and Organs of the Congregation of the Index;" "History of the Congr. of the Index;" "Authority of the S. Congr. of the Index." These three articles have appeared in *The Catholic* of Mentz, 1864, Vol. I. Cfr., especially, *Heymans*, De ecclesiastica librorum aliorumque scriptorum in Belgia prohibitorum disciplina disquisitio, Brux., 1849.

[3] *P. Kleutgen, S.J.*, Theology and Philosophy of Past Ages. Cfr. *Dieringer*, Theology of the Past and of the Present Ages.

[4] The School of St. Thomas, 5 vols.

[5] *Mattes*, Ancient and Modern Scholasticism (Tübing. Quart. Rev. of Theol., 1844, 1845). *Deutinger*, The Principle of Modern Philosophy and Christian Science, 1857. Cfr. *The Catholic* of 1866, Vol. I., p. 693 sq.

Deutinger, the controversy finally assumed a more definite shape in the hands of Professor *Clemens*[1] of Münster, and Professor *Kuhn* of Tübingen, the former the author of a work entitled *Philosophy the Handmaid of Theology* (*Philosophia ancilla Theologiæ*, 1865), and the latter of another entitled *The Connection between Theology and Philosophy*. Both of the disputants conceded that the real question at issue was to determine what are precisely the relations of the natural to the supernatural order; and while Clemens admitted that philosophy and theology are quite distinct from and *independent* of each other, he still maintained that there is such a thing as a *theological* philosophy, to which divine revelation holds the relation of an *external* authority and rule of guidance. On the other hand, Kuhn maintained that if the integrity of Catholic principles was to be preserved, and the Lutheran error, concerning the incapacity of the human mind to acquire any knowledge of truth by its unaided efforts, avoided, it must necessarily be admitted that philosophy, whether in its inception, its development, or its maturity, is wholly the product of the natural powers of the intellect, working independently of the lights of supernatural revelation and the inspiration of positive faith.

After the death of Clemens (at Rome, February 24, 1862), and even during his lifetime, the controversy was taken up by the writers for *The Catholic of Mentz*, and by *Scheeben* and *Dr. Schäzler*, two prominent contributors to *The Historico-political Papers*, who concentrated their energies on determining the precise sense of the term *Supernatural*, or, as it is now written, *Super-nature*, and fixing definitely the import of the ideas conveyed by the words *liberty*, *nature*, *personality*, and *grace*. By Schäzler *grace* was held to be an *endowment*, restoring human nature to its *completeness;* by Kuhn, a gift by which *man is perfected* in his personality.[2]

As days went on the controversy drifted into those interminable subtleties and distinctions, which are to be met with in wearisome reiteration in the quarrels between the Thomists and the Scotists of a former age, and more recently between the Jesuits and Dominicans during the period of Jansenism. The language of the disputants grew vague and shadowy and their reasoning obscure. For the present the faintest hope of a definite solution of the question could not be entertained. In the midst of this confusion and conflict, *A. Schmid*, then a professor at Dillingen, but subsequently at Munich, made an attempt, in which he was less successful than he deserved to be,[3] to harmonize

[1] *Clemens*, Our Position in Philosophy (*The Catholic*, new series, year 1859, in two articles). The *same*, De Scholasticorum sententia, philosophiam esse theologiæ ancillam, Monasterii, 1865. *Kuhn*, Discussion on Philosophy and Theology, Tübingen, 1860. The *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Concerning a Free Catholic University in Germany, Tübingen, 1863; The Natural and Supernatural, being a Reply to the Charges made by the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*.

[2] *Scheeben*, Nature and Grace, Mentz, 1861. *Von Schäzler*, Natural and Supernatural, being a Criticism of Kuhn's Theology, Mentz, 1866.

[3] For a statement of the scientific tendency and a thorough *examination* of *Von Schäzler's* work, see The Theological and Literary Review, ed. by *Reusch*, year 1866, nros. 18-22.

the differences of the two parties and bring about a reconciliation. A second attempt was made by *Döllinger*, *Haneberg*, and *Alzog*,[1] who called a conference of the most learned men of both sides to meet at Munich. The opposing parties being mutually suspicious of each other, little if anything was accomplished. Even the Neo-Scholastics acknowledged, however, that the deputies had the best of intentions, and that, had it not been found necessary to adjourn the conference it might have rendered important services towards the adjustment of the differences that separated these two schools of thought.[2]

Many attempts have been recently made to harmonize the difficulties arising out of the relations of philosophy to theology, and, in particular, of modern to scholastic philosophy. The way had been made clear for these by *Charles Werner* in his inquiry as to *whether a Christian could exercise full liberty of thought in the study of philosophy, without detriment to Catholic doctrine or turning his back on theology and the Church*.[3]

Schmid and *Wörter*,[4] who had been charged by Schäzler with holding erroneous doctrines, fully vindicated their orthodoxy, and their able and lucid exposition must have convinced their assailant that his imputation was unmerited.

It will be well for the advocates of both schools to bear in mind that the differences between them, if a judgment may be formed from the works already published, are not nearly so great as those that divided the schools of the Middle Ages; and it will be also to their advantage and honour if they mutually give their adversaries credit with being *equally* as loyal as themselves to Mother Church, and equally devoted to the true interests of sacred science. Then, like the great theologians of the early and Middle Ages, they will really advance the progress of science, and contribute to the solution of the most difficult problems.

§ 421. *Sects in Germany.*

During the period of the despotic domination of Napoleon and the consequent disorders in the Church, many false mystical sects sprung up in Austria. *Martin Boos* indulged in some fanciful re-

1 The Labours of the Scholars' Convention in Munich, from September 28 to October 1, 1863.

2 Cfr. The Convention of Catholic Scholars, in *The Catholic* of 1864, Vol. II., pp. 95-111, and 196-221. This article winds up with the Papal Brief, accompanied with cautions. *Michelis*, Church or Party? A Frank and Open Word to the German Episcopacy, Münster, 1864. *Hergenroether*, Church and No Party, Würzburg, 1865. The Adverse Representation of the Labours of the Scholars' Convention, in the *Civiltà Cattolica*; translated into German under the title The Past and the Present of Theology, Mentz, 1864; was partially refuted by *The Catholic* of 1864, Vol. II., p. 109.

3 *Werner*, Manner of Coming to an Agreement on the Nature and Object of Christian Philosophy at the Present Epoch, Schaffh., 1867. The *same*, On the Essence and Idea of the Human Soul, 2nd ed., Brixen, 1868.

4 *Schmid*, Science and Authority, with a special reference to Schäzler's works, entitled "New Investigations on the Dogma of Grace and the Nature of Christian Faith," Munich, 1868. *Wörter*, Repulsion of the Latest Attacks against the Present Faculty of Cath. Theology at the Univ. of Freiburg, 1868.

veries, and taught in vague and incoherent language the Lutheran doctrine of justification *by faith alone*. He was pursued, arrested, cast into prison, and finally expelled the diocese of Linz, but not until after he had perverted many of the clergy and made them his followers. He died pastor of Sayn, near Neuwied, in 1825.

Thomas Pöschl, a native of Bohemia, founded a still more fanatical sect in the same diocese. God and the Blessed Virgin, he and his followers said, appeared to them, commanding them to purify themselves. The process of purification consisted in taking a powder, whose secret powers were potent to drive the devil from their bodies. Napoleon they regarded as the forerunner of Antichrist, and his reign as the inauguration of the millennium. This fanaticism rose to such a degree, that in Holy Week of 1817 they immolated a human being. The sect was then suppressed by Government in Salzburg, and the fanatical sectaries rendered harmless by being shut up in prison. Pöschl ended his days, in 1837, in the hospital for infirm priests at Vienna.

The sect of the *Manhartians*, founded by *Hagleitner*, a priest, had its origin in the *valley of the Brixen*, a portion of Tyrol, belonging to the diocese of Salzburg. These sectaries were the determined and implacable foes of all who had taken the oath of allegiance to Napoleon, particularly if they were priests, who, by so doing, they contended, had incurred equally with the usurper the sentence of excommunication directed against him. Two of their number, *Mangl* and *Mair*, having made a pilgrimage to Romè in 1825, were there disabused of their errors by *Mauro Capellari*, afterwards Gregory XVI., and permitted to again receive the Sacraments; and they in their turn brought back the bulk of their followers. The politico-religious sect of the *Salpetrians*, which sprung up in the south-east part of the Black Forest, in 1764, was in many respects similar to that of the Manhartians. They openly refused obedience to the abbot of the Monastery of St. Blaise; defied the authority of the Government of Austria, and later on of Baden; and excited the people against *Demeter*, Archbishop of Freiburg, and his clergy, who, they said, were not Roman Catholics. They left off going to church, declined to send their children to school, and when legally prosecuted, paid the stipulated fine, rather than submit. They appealed to Rome, and some of them went there in person to present their claims, but to no purpose. By 1838 they had nearly, if not quite, disappeared.[2]

An agitation of wider scope and more threatening dimensions was that whose promoters were designated as *enlightened* or *liberal* Catholics, and were subsequently known as *German Catholics*. Influenced by the prevalent tone of Protestant literature and swayed by Protes-

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., p. 829 sq., s. v. "*Schwärmerei*;" Fr. tr., Vol. 8, p. 365. *Ginzel* (Austrian Quarterly, 1867); Essay of a Hist. of Religious Fanaticism, Martin *Boos*, &c.

[2] † *Dr. Hansjacob*, The Salpetrians Examined and Exposed, 1st and 2nd enlarged ed., Waldshut, 1867.

tant principles, by which even good Catholics had become infected, they aimed at subverting the whole economy of the Catholic Church. Priests and laymen, calling themselves *enlightened* and *liberal*, but indiscreet, and possessing little knowledge of the matter in hand, advocated the abolition of the Latin language in the offices of the Church, the simplification of her ceremonies and their adaptation to the spirit of modern times, the abrogation of the rule of celibacy among the clergy, and the establishment of a German national Church, besides a number of other innovations. These views were propagated through the writings of *Wessenberg* and in the pages of *The Annuary of Ulm; The Candid Leaves*, edited by *Pflanz; The Catholic Leaves*, edited by *Fischer;* and *The Canonical Guardian*, edited by *Alexander Müller* and his colleagues, *Carové, Fridolin Huber, Reichlin-Meldegg, Schreiber*, and others, most of whom had long since interiorly apostatized, and were only restrained by interested motives from breaking altogether with the Catholic Church.[1] These reformers were particularly active in the Grand Duchy of Baden, in Würtemburg and Switzerland, and, for a season, in the territory of Treves and in Saxony; and the *Theiner* brothers imported the new ideas into Silesia.[2] *Augustine Theiner*, the younger of these, after an extended trip through England and France, settled at Rome, where he renounced his former errors, and by his historical works rendered an important service to Catholic literature. He died at Civitâ Vecchia, August 9, 1874.[3] *Fischer*, a Catholic priest and professor of *moral* theology at Lucerne, pursued quite a different course. Not content with taking a wife, he had the

[1] "Why the '*Liberals*' still Remain within the Fold of the Catholic Church" (*Bonn Review*, nro. 1, p. 190); *Philalethes* (Bp. Reisach), "What have we to Expect from the Reformers of Offenbach and of Saint-Gall?" being a Dialogue between a Parish Priest and his Parishioners, Mentz, 1835. Cfr. "Reform of the Church," in *The Catholic* of 1833, January number, p. 84 sq., and "The Catholic Church and the Reformers," 1841, January, February, April, July, October, and November numbers, and *The South German Eccl. Journal*, 1841, nro. 34.

[2] (Jno. Anth. *Theiner*), The Catholic Church in Silesia, Altenburg, 1826; assisted by his brother: The Forced Celibacy of the Catholic Priests, Altenburg, 1828, 3 vols. Cfr. *Braun*, On the Writings of Professor *Anthony Theiner*, Bonn, 1829. Dr. *Franke*, Sketch of a Great Reformer, where *Anth. Theiner* is delineated from the point of view of his science and of his life, Glatz, 1845.

[3] *Aug. Theiner*, De Pseudo-Isidoriana canonum collectione, Wratislaviæ, 1827. Hist. of Clerical Seminaries, Mentz, 1835. Lettere storico-critiche intorno alle "Cinque Piaghe della Santa Chiesa" del Chiarissimo D. Antonio Rosmini Serbati, 1848; Latin tr., Naples, 1849. As keeper of the secret archives of the Vatican (fr. 1851), he issued various compilations illustrating the eccl. hist. of nearly all the different Christian nations, viz., Sweden and Her Relation to the Holy See; Latest situation of the Cath. Church in Poland and Russia; Hist. of the Conversion of the Reigning Houses of Brunswick and Saxony to the Cath. Church; Hungaria sacra; Monuments historiques de Russie, 1859, 2 T, f. Continuation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius, 3 vols., fol., 1856 sq.; Codex Diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctæ Sedis, 6 vols., fol., Rome, 1861-1863; smaller work, in answer to Passaglia's appeal to the Italian bishops, 1864. In 1869 he entered into a correspondence with Dr. Doellinger and Prof. Friedrich, and was barred all access to the archives. In 1874 Theiner visited Austria to make arrangements for publishing his *Acta genuina SS. œcum. Conc. Trid.*, &c., Zagrabiæ, 1874, 2 T., 4to, a work of questionable accuracy and fidelity; also his *Hist. of Clement XIV.*, written in answer to Crétineau-Joly's Hist. of the Suppression of the Jesuits (2 vols., Lps. and Paris, 1853), led to a long and bitter pamphlet controversy. (Tr.)

indelicacy, when one of his children died, to invite his friends to the funeral. In the present age the import of such conduct cannot be mistaken, and men guilty of it must in time, if not at once, cut themselves off from the Church. Though they may call themselves Catholics, they are such only in *name*. Being destitute of all religious conviction, it is impossible for them to openly profess for any length of time doctrines which they secretly deny. And their position will be rendered all the more difficult in the measure in which Catholic faith grows more living and energetic, religious literature more Catholic in tone, and the faithful become more ardently attached to the teachings and laws of the Church. This will be particularly the case at a time when it is the tendency of political events to separate persons of different religious creeds by sharp lines of demarcation. Such has been, in matter of fact, the history of these liberal Catholics. They remained in the Church as long as they could, and when a formal separation became imperative, they sought only a decent pretext. This was soon supplied. *John Ronge*, a suspended Silesian priest, professed to be shocked at the honours paid to the Holy Coat[1] at Treves, which was exhibited to the faithful in the cathedral of that city during a pilgrimage, lasting from the 18th of August to the 6th of October, 1844; and in a letter addressed to Mgr. *Arnoldi*, the bishop († January 9, 1864), he publicly denounced the whole affair as shameless idolatry. His next act was to issue a call to the "German Catholics" to secede from Rome. The writers for the Liberal and Protestant press of Saxony and Silesia, feigning to believe his impious slanders, grew virtuously indignant. Their inveterate hatred of Catholicity again broke forth, and found expression in vituperative and fiery denunciations of the Pope, whom they designated as the tyrant of consciences and the shame of Germany. Catholic priests were derided and insulted; the obsolete and savage polemics of a bygone age was revived; false confessions of faith and ludicrous forms of abjuration, which Catholics had a hundred times indignantly disclaimed, were again sent forth to the world as genuine Catholic documents; and all manner of untruthful reports were set afloat concerning bishops. By such cruel and dishonest methods of warfare, pursued with a consistency and a patience that lent to misrepresentation and falsehood the colour of truth and honesty, were many laymen and priests finally prevailed upon to separate themselves from the Catholic Church.[2] Ronge, a man wholly destitute of theological knowledge,

[1] *Marx*, Prof. of Ch. H., Hist. of the Holy Coat, Treves, 1844. *J. Von Goerres*, The Pilgrimage to Treves, Ratisbon, 1845. Against *Gildemeister's* and *Sybel's* pamphlet, entitled "The Holy Coat of Treves and the Twenty Other Seamless Coats." *Clemens* published "The Holy Coat of Treves and Protestant Criticism," Coblentz, 1845; and "The Holy Coat of Treves and No Other, or The Censorious Tailors of Bonn," by a Pilgrim of Coblentz, Coblentz, 1845. *Dr. Hansen*, District Physician of Treves, Report and Official Documents Relative to the Miraculous Cures Wrought during the Exhibition of the Holy Coat of Treves, in 1844, Treves, 1845.

[2] *Baltzer*, Liberty of the Press and Censorship with Regard to the Pilgrimage of Treves, Breslau, 1845. *Christ*, Examination of the Latest Reform Sermons and anti-Catholic Literature, Ratisbon, 1845. The Industrial Exposition of Berlin and the Exposition of the Holy Coat of Treves. Letter of a Berlin *Protestant*, Münster, 1845.

and whose life bore not the slightest token of a religious mind, was thus led on by force of circumstances to play the part of a reformer, and, much to his own surprise and possibly to his amusement, was nailed as *another Luther*, whose memory would be held in benediction by future generations. Assuming with simulated gravity the character of a reformer, he organized a religious community at Breslau, rejecting all but *two of the Sacraments*, and even these he so diluted and explained away that they ceased to have either meaning or import. The "friends of enlightenment," as those who had been slapping Ronge on the back and cheering him on delighted to be called, were not a little astonished to see themselves left far away behind in the race of radicalism by their precocious neophyte. Ronge, of course, had imitators. *Czerski*, a priest, having disregarded his vows of celibacy and given public scandal, was condemned by his superiors to undergo a punishment, which, considering the offence, was extremely light. He, however, refused to submit, and desiring to give colour of legality to his course, became the founder of a new community of sectaries at Schneidemühl, in the Grand Duchy of Posen. Although these were thoroughly *Protestant* in principle and doctrine, especially concerning the Sacraments, they had the effrontery to call themselves *Catholics*.[1] Nevertheless, at the so-called *Council of Leipsig*, March 22, 1845, *Czerski* put his signature to a formulary of faith, which, from a Christian point of view, is absolute nihilism.[2] Such was the origin of the sect which presumptuously arrogated to itself the title of "*German Catholic*," and even called itself the "*Christian Catholic and Apostolic Church*." *Ullmann*, himself a Protestant, has very justly remarked that the founders of this sect had nothing in common with Catholicity, as portrayed in history, and had therefore no shadow of right to call themselves "*Catholics*."[3] True Catholics were very naturally indignant at the assumption, but their indignation was still further intensified when governments, with a keen appreciation of the insult conveyed in the title, styled these arrogant sectaries "*Dissenting Catholics*."

Actuated by motives of long-cherished hostility to the Catholic religion, the Prussian Government permitted these apostles of impiety and enemies of Christianity to go up and down freely through the kingdom, everywhere misrepresenting by word and writing the Catholic Church, her doctrines and her institutions, and reviling and deriding Catholics, notwithstanding the fact that the rights of the latter had been most solemnly guaranteed, and they themselves promised immunity from insult and outrage. But the Berlin Govern-

[1] Analysis of the "Confession of Schneidemühl," Posen (Dec.), 1844. Open Letter to Czerski, by a Roman Catholic Priest, once his Schoolmate, Posen, 1845. Open Letter to Roman Catholics on the Justification of Czerski, by *Jurek*, Lissa, 1845.

[2] *Leipsig Symbol:* I believe in God the Father, who, by his omnipotent word, created the world, and governs in truth, in justice, and in love. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Christian Church, holy and universal; in the remission of sin and life everlasting. Amen.

[3] *Ullmann*, My Misgivings as to the German Catholic Movement (*Theological Studies* and *Criticisms*, year 1845, nro. IV)

ment soon learned that its anticipations were incorrect and its hopes groundless. The sectaries did indeed succeed in gaining over a few Catholics, who were such only in *name and appearance*, but they did incomparably greater harm to *Protestantism*, out of which their principles sprung, and to which they were therefore *naturally allied.* Protestant free-thinkers, or the "friends of enlightenment," encouraged by the attitude of the Government towards the sectaries, boldly demanded for themselves the freedom that had been so cheerfully granted to apostate Catholics.[1] "*The schism,*" said Protestant theologians, "*has sunk deeper into the Protestant than into the Catholic Church.*"[2] The agitation was at first, to all appearances, a purely religious one; but it was not long until a revolutionary and communistic element was imported into it by one *Dowiat.* The principles that had been applied to religion were now applied to *politics*, and it soon became evident that they tended to unsettle the foundations of the throne, as well as those of the altar. *Gervinus*,[3] who had witnessed the early efforts of sectaries with satisfaction, and had contributed not a little to their success, now frankly avowed that the underlying principles of this insidious movement were *political*, and not theological, and that it was driven forward by appeals to the passions of the people. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and Austria had already made a stand against the movement, and Prussia, now waking to a sense of her own danger, began to take severe measures against the so-called "Dissenting Catholics." Strange to say, they never made but *one* convert of eminent ability and sincere piety to their opinions, and never published a theological periodical adequately meeting even the most moderate demands of science. The nearest approach to such a publication was the *Catholic Church Reform* (monthly) of Berlin, which was suspended after a short existence. The tone of its articles was a verification of the words of *Lessing*, in one of his letters, written in 1769. "Don't speak to me," said he, "of your freedom of thought and speech at Berlin. There is no freedom there except that of putting on sale the insults anyone may choose to fling at religion, and every honest man should blush to make use of such freedom." John Ronge, during the remainder of his restless life, continued to propagate his errors, and made many ineffectual attempts to organize communities in different cities and towns. On the 7th of May, 1872, he was fined and cast into prison at Frankfort, when he was informed by the "German Catholics" of that city that his services would be dispensed with for the future, and that he would do well to seek some other field of labour.

While these events were a severe trial to Catholics, whether priests or laymen, they also furnished an occasion for the publication of a

[1] "The Protestants," said Ronge, in a letter, "come to us because they desire liberty; and yet they experience only oppression and tyranny from governments."

[2] *Köhler* and *Klopsch*, Repertory of Ch. H., Glogau, 1845, p. 345.

[3] Mission of the German Catholics, Heidelberg, 1845

variety of works,[1] in which the more majestic and deeper views of Catholicity, hitherto to be found only in writings designed for the learned, were given to the world in a popular form and in language at once easily intelligible and attractive. The effect was instantaneous and consoling. The teachings of the Church became better known, and, as a consequence, more appreciated and loved; and those who had been hitherto hesitating in belief, and indifferent in practice, put aside all indecision, and grew firm in their faith and strict in their observance. The leaders of the various scattered communities of "German Catholics" are still busily at work in devising a *religion of the future*, adequate to the wants of *pure and regenerate humanity*. Of course their efforts have all been disastrous failures, but they draw a melancholy consolation from the congenial labour of giving currency to obsolete prejudices against the Catholic Church, and to imputations as false as they are cruel and injurious.

§ 422. *The Catholic Church in Russia and Poland.*

For Literature, cf. § 410.

The depressed condition of the Church in Russia is in melancholy contrast with the revival of Catholic life in the various countries whose histories we have been reviewing. Notwithstanding that a comparatively liberal Constitution had been granted under *Alexander II.*, the persecution of the Catholic Church in Russia and Poland, which had been begun under the Emperor Nicholas, by a strange anomaly, was not abated but intensified.[2]

After the celebration of the tenth centenary of the foundation of the empire in 1862, when a splendid facsimile edition of *Tischendorf's Codex Sinaiticus*,[3] containing the most ancient and best authenticated Greek text of the Bible, was published, and after the suppression of the insurrection in Poland, in 1863, the persecution grew more violent

[1] *Staudenmaier*, The Nature of the Catholic Church, being a Reply to Her Adversaries, Freiburg, 1845. *Idem*, On the Religious Peace of the Future, Freiburg, 1846, 3 pts. *Hirscher*, Study on the Great Religious Questions of the Day, Dedicated to the Higher and Middle Classes, together with an Examination into the Motion of Deputy *Zittel*, relative to the Equality of Seceding Dissenters before the Law, Freiburg, 1846. *Scharpff*, Catholicism and Rationalism, Tübingen, 1845. *Von Linde*, Reflections on the Recent Ecclesiastical Events, considered in their Relations to Right and Policy, Mentz, 1845. *Idem*, Church Establishment, Liberty of Conscience, and Religious Associations, *ibid.*, 1845. *Sporschil*, Practical Difficulties of any Attempt at Establishing an Apostolic and Catholic Denomination in Germany, and two other works, by the same, Lps., 1845. *Peter* and *Paul*, Being a Monthly in the Interest of the Catholic Church, amidst the Troubles of the Day, ed. by *Dr. Hast*, of Berlin, and the *Collection of Seasonable Writings* in Defence of the Catholic Church, and chiefly the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. 15-18, years 1845, 1846.

[2] *Baron A. v. Haxthausen*, The Constitution of Russia and the Laws of 1861, Leipsig, 1866.

[3] This is the photo-lithographical facsimile edition of the whole Sinaitic Bible, published at the expense of the Emperor of Russia, in 4 vols. (3 for the Old and 1 for the N. T.; the latter is 148 folios). under the title Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. Auspiciis augustissimi imp. Alex. II., ed. Const. Tischendorf, Petropoli, 1862. A copy of this rare edition is in the Astor Library of New York. (Tr.)

and systematic.[1] It was the design to extirpate at a blow both the religion and the nationality of Poland, for the religious and patriotic feelings of the Poles are so closely interwoven as to be practically inseparable. The gallant struggle of this heroic people to maintain their national existence failed either to elicit the admiration or excite the pity of their brutal conquerors. Their patriotic aspirations were literally extinguished in blood. Priests and monks, when not shot or strangled, were carried away into desolate Siberia. On the 28th of November, 1864, one hundred and four monasteries were abolished, and their inmates, surprised and seized the evening before, forcibly hurried away into distant exile. The banished Catholic priests were replaced by Greek popes, and Catholics themselves compelled by barbarous enactments and cruel tortures to conform to the Ruthuenian Liturgy, and have their children baptized by schismatical priests, whom they abhorred. The Augsburg Universal Gazette, speaking of these events, in an issue of recent date,[2] says: "In the district of Siedlec the peasants still refuse to take part in divine services celebrated by Russian priests. They meet clandestinely on Sundays for private devotions, and conceal their children, to keep them out of the way of the popes. The Russian magistrates endeavour to win over the refractory peasants by the arts of persuasion. They arrest the leaders and cast them into prison, but again set them at liberty when they see the peasants organizing and preparing to resort to violent measures for the liberation of the prisoners."

In the hope of making the Church entirely subservient to the Civil Power, the Tzar, by confiscating ecclesiastical property, deprived her ministers of all means of independent support, and allowed them instead a salary from the Goverment. *Pius IX.* protested vehemently against these violent measures,[3] but to no purpose. The Russian ambassador even went the length of insulting the Pope in his own apartments, when offering him the congratulations of the season on New Year's Day of 1866, and the Holy Father was forced, in self-defence, to order the vulgar representative of the northern barbarian out of his presence. Diplomatic relations between the cabinet of St. Petersburg and the Holy See were immediately broken off, and the violence of the persecution against the Catholics of Russia and Poland still further increased. Bishop *Dupanloup* gave expression to the sorrow and indignation which these cruel proceedings inspired in every generous bosom in his report of the Centenary of SS. Peter and Paul at Rome.[4] "At a time," said he, "when five hundred bishops are

[1] *Montalembert*, L'Insurrection Polonaise, Paris, 1863.

[2] Augsb. Univ. Gaz., No. 265, of September 22, 1867, p. 4217.

[3] The Roman official document of 1842, comprising ninety articles of proof, issued under Pope Gregory XVI., was followed by a further complaint of Pius IX. at Christmas, 1866, 368 pages, 4to: Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del sommo Pontefice Pio IX., a riparo dei mali che soffre la chiesa cattolica nei dominii di Russia e di Polonia. In January, 1878, Cardinal *Simeoni* published a Memorandum, signed by *Pius IX.*, exposing the treachery of Russian diplomacy. (Tr.)

[4] The Late Festivals of Rome, tr. fr. the French into Germ., by Dr. *Rütjes*, Essen, 1867, p. 14.

gathered about the Common Father of Christendom, representing the nations of the world, there is *one* country dear to us above all others by its sufferings, its fidelity, and its heroism, *whose chief pastors are absent.* Oh, dear Church of Poland! in vain have we sought for but a single one of thy bishops, that we might kiss his hands as we would those of a martyr's, but none was to be found. Alas, O Poland, when will they cease to tear the bleeding from the bosom of thy Mother and ours?"

Since 1872 there have been indications, though very slight ones, that some satisfactory understanding may be arrived at between Rome and St. Petersburg.[1]

§ 423. *The Missions of the Catholic Church.*

Choix de Lettres édifiantes et curieuses jusqu' à 1808, continuées jusqu' en 1820 dans les Nouvelles Lettres édifiantes, auxquelles se lient les Annales de la propagation de la foi (from 1822), Germ., Cologne, 1834 sq.; and *Einsiedeln*, Synopsis of the History and Statistics of Catholic Missions during the first forty years of this century are given in the *Univers*, September 13, 1839. Cfr. *Sion*, October of 1839, and January of 1840; September, nro. 113; November, nro. 142, Supplem. New Synopsis in the volumes of the *Propagation of the Faith*, 1857, nro. IV., p. 57 sq. Father *Charles of Saint Aloysius*, The Catholic Church in Her Actual Extension over the Earth, Ratisbon, 1845. *P. Wittmann*, Beauty of the Church in Her Missions, &c. **Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 595-759, with documents. †*Henrion*, Catholic Missions, Vol. IV., pp. 703-802. †*Hahn*, Hist. of Catholic Missions from the Times of Jesus Christ down to our Own Day, Cologne, 1858. †*Margraf*, The Church and Slavery from the Discovery of America, Tübingen, 1865. *Kalkar*, History of the Roman Catholic Missions, in Danish; Germ. ed., in collaboration with the author, edited by *Michelsen*, Erlangen, 1867. *R. von Wedell*, Hist. and Geogr. Atlas, nro. VI., map 34. *W. J. Kip*, "Jesuit Missions in North America," New York, 1846. *De Smet*, Oregon Missions, 1847. *Huc*, Christianity in China, Tartary, and Thibet, 2 vols., London, 1853. *T. G. Shea*, Hist. of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S., New York, 1855. Relations des Jésuites, 3 vols., Quebec, 1858. *T. W. M.*

---

[1] We subjoin here the hierarchical organization of the Russian "*Orthodox Church*," directed by the "*Holy Synod.*" Metropolitan Sees: 1. *Kiev* and Halicz; 2. Novgorod and *St. Petersburg;* 3. *Moscow* and Kolomna; 4. *Kasan* and Sviajsk; 5. *Astrachan* and Enotaïevsk; 6. *Tobolsk* and West Siberia; 7. Jaroslav and *Rostow;* 8. *Pskov*, Livonia, and Courland; 9. *Riazan* and Saraisk; 10. *Tver*, with the seat at Kaschin; 11. *Cherson;* 12. *Sebastopol;* 13. *Tchernigov* and Niechin; 14. *Minsk* and Bobrousk; 15. Podolia and Braislav, with the seat at *Kamieniec;* 16. *Kishenev* and Chotim; 17. White Russia and *Lithuania;* 18. *Vladimir* and Susdal; 19. *Vologda* and Ustjuk. Episcopal sees: 1. *Jrkutsk* and East Siberia; 2. *Mohilev* and Mstislav; 3. *Olonetsk* and Petrozavodsk; 4. *Novo Tcherkask* and Georgievski; 5. *Ekaterinoslav;* 6. *Smolensk* and Dogorobousch; 7. *Nishnei Novgorod* and Arsamas; 8. *Kursk* and Bielgorod; 9. *Polotsk;* 10. *Tula* and Bielev. 11. *Viätka* and Slobodskoi; 12. *Archangelsk* and Kholmogori; 13. *Voronesh* and Zadonski; 14. *Kostroma* and Galitch; 15. *Tambov* and Chatsk; 16. *Orel* and Sievsk; 17. *Poltava* and Pereuislav; 18. Volhynia and *Zitomir;* 19. *Perm* and Ekaterinburg; 20. *Kharkov* and Ucraine; 21. *Ostrog;* 22. *Pinsk;* 23. *Tomsk;* 24. *Wilna;* 25. *Vitebsk;* 26. *Warsaw* Total, forty-five eparchies or dioceses. There are, moreover, ten vicariates erected in provinces with a preponderating Catholic or Protestant population. The Russian prelates, from the reign of Catharine II. (1764), have been divided into *three* classes, answering to the military grades of *general-in-chief*, *lieutenant-general*, and *major-general.* Their tenure is at the pleasure of the Tzar. Those of the first rank receive an annual salary of 1,500, those of the second, 1,200, and those of the third, 1,000 roubles; the prelates are also allowed money for the table, for six horses for their consistories (5-7 members), their numerous cathedral clergy, officials, and menial servants. The secular clergy, from the colour of their liturgical vestments, are designated as the *white*, whilst the monks are styled the *black clergy.* See *Jacob Neher*, Eccl. Geogr., Vol. II., pp. 416-426. (Tr.)

Marshall, Christian Missions, Their Agents and Their Results, 2 vols., London and Brussels, 1862; New York, 1864. *J. Neher*, Eccl. Geogr. and Statistics, 3 vols., Ratisbon, 1864-1868. *Grundemann*, Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867-1871. *Catholic Missions* (an illustrated monthly), Freiburg and St. Louis, 1873 sq.

Obedient to the injunction of our Lord to preach the Gospel to all nations and to every creature, the Catholic Church has in all ages sent her missionaries into every part of the habitable globe.[1] Since the rise of Protestantism, and notably since the defection of the great maritime powers from the Church, two classes of missionaries have unhappily come face to face in nearly every country of the world, mutually opposed to each other, and the one not unfrequently undoing the work of the other. But, in the face of every obstacle, the Catholic religion has gone steadily forward, gaining triumph after triumph, until at last there is not a corner of the earth in which its teachings are not proclaimed and professed. In the present century the glorious field of missionary work, in which the great *St. Francis Xavier* was first to labour in modern times, has been cultivated with encouraging success.

The Missions may be conveniently distributed into the following five geographical divisions:—

I. The *Eastern Missions*, comprising the Crimean Peninsula, the Grecian Archipelago, Constantinople, Syria, Armenia, Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia.

II. The *India Missions*, extending as far as the Philippine Islands.

III. The *Missions of China*, including Siam, Cochin-China, Tung-King, and Japan.

IV. The *American Missions*, which, starting at Hudson's Bay, include the Canadas, British America, the Indian Territory, the country along the Rocky Mountains, and the Antilles, ending at Paraguay.

V. The *Missions of Oceanica*, including Australia.

These missions, though under the direction of the *Propaganda* at Rome, are mainly supported by the *Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, founded at Lyons in 1822; by the *Association of the Holy Childhood of Jesus*, founded at Paris in 1844; by the *Leopoldine Association* of Austria; by the *Association of* (King) *Louis* of Bavaria; and by the St. *Francis Xavier Association*, in the archdiocese of Cologne. There is also a number of institutions in the Roman Catholic Church *specially devoted to the work of training missionaries*, as, for example, the College of the *Propaganda* at Rome, the most famous missionary establishment in the world; *Saint-Lazare*, or the *Seminary for Foreign Missions*, and the *Seminary of St. Esprit*, at *Paris;* the Seminary of the *Marists at Lyons;* the College of *All Hallows*, near *Dublin*, Ireland; *St. Joseph's College* at *Mill Hill*, near *London*, England, exclusively devoted to missionary work among the negroes; the *Chinese College* at *Naples;* the Seminary for the Missions of *Central Africa*

[1] A Few Words on the Missions of the Catholic Church, *Tübingen Quart. Review*, 1825.

at *Verona;* besides other missionary colleges in Alsace and Lorraine, at Milan, Louvain, and near Brussels. Moreover, the Religious Orders, as a rule, train some of their members for foreign missionary work, and many of them have special houses set apart for the purpose. Many dioceses and vicariates-apostolic in Pagan lands are given in charge by the Propaganda to the various Religious Orders, on the understanding that they are to supply them with a number of priests adequate to the necessities of the missions. The Orders most numerously represented in the foreign missions are the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Lazarists, the Picpus Society, the Marists, the Capuchins, and the Carmelites. There are also seminaries, like that of *Penang* in British Asia, established in purely missionary countries, for the education of such of the natives as desire to devote themselves to the work of evangelizing their countrymen. The progress of the far-away missions is given in the *Annuario Pontificio*, now called the *Gerarchia Cattolica*, from which we learn that new bishoprics and apostolic vicariates are annually established in them.[1]

I. EASTERN MISSIONS.

In the new Kingdom of *Greece*, where there are ten or twelve schismatical bishops and three bishops and two priests recognizing the authority of the *Permanent Holy Synod* of Russia, introduced July 23, 1833,[2] there is already one Roman Catholic archbishop at *Naxos*, together with five bishops residing respectively at *Andros*, *Skio*, *Syra*, *Tinos*, and *Santorin*.[3] There is also an archiepiscopal see at *Athens*. The total number of Catholics in these bishoprics is about 30,000. *Mgr. Aloysius Maria Blancis*, Bishop of Syra, is the Apostolic Legate, and is recognized by the Government as such. New churches have been recently built at Athens, Piræus, Hiracli, Patras, and Navarino.

The *Catholic* Church is spread over the *whole* of European, Asiatic, and African *Turkey*, where she has *sixty-six episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, eleven vicariates, and two apostolic prefectures*. Of these, eleven episcopal and two archiepiscopal sees are situated in European Turkey. It is estimated that there are about 900,000 Catholics in European and Asiatic Turkey: 260,000 in the former, and 640,000 in the latter provinces, all of whom have been bitterly persecuted.

There is a *patriarch* in *Constantinople*, and eight episcopal sees and five apostolic vicariates in Bulgaria,[4] Walachia, Moldavia, Serbia, Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, where, in spite of the crafty opposition of the Greek Schismatics, the brutal violence of the Mussulman, and the intrigues of the Russians, much progress has been made by the combined efforts of the Lazarists, Minorites, Capuchins, Italian Passionists, and Sisters of Charity.[5]

The *United Armenians*, besides a special patriarch, residing at Bsommar, on Mount Libanus, have also a primate archbishop at Constantinople, who, after the conclusion of the Peace of Adrianople, September 14, 1829, was honoured with the dignity of the patri-

---

[1] Cf. *American Cyclopædia*, art. Missions (Foreign). (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Schmitt*, Hist. of the Modern Greek and Russian Church, pp. 178 sq.; *Hefele*, Supplement to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., pp. 439, 443.

[3] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, pp. 34 and 41. (Tr.)

[4] On the 18th of December, 1860, two hundred Bulgarian notables petitioned Mgr. *Brunoni*, the Pope's Delegate at Constantinople, for their nation's readmission to the Catholic Church. On the 21st of January, 1861, Pius IX. expressed the excess of his joy over this auspicious event. But schism, heresy, and Islamism conspired against the Church of God, and prevented the consummation of the act; many Bulgarian villages, however, with their priests, remained steadfast in their professions of union with Rome. (Tr.)

[5] *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, February 21, 1843. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., pp. 331 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 24, p. 249 sq. *Gams*, Vol. I., p. 183 sq.

archal office. On the 11th of July, 1830, Archbishop Nurigian, who had been consecrated at Rome, received the pallium from *Pius VIII.* New bishoprics were established for the Catholic Armenians by *Gregory XVI.* in 1832, and by *Pius IX.* in 1854. Pius IX.[1] found it necessary to reprehend the conduct of some of the clergy, who, under the pretext of promoting Catholic unity, thwarted the efforts of the Holy See to maintain the old Armenian Rite, and conformed to that of the Schismatics. They also advocated the abolition of certain usages, which had been lawfully introduced, and had a special significance, in that they showed the detestation of the Catholic Armenians for schism and their attachment to Catholic unity.

When the Armenian bishops failed to come to the Vatican Council, and it became known that they were secretly agitating against unity at home, Pius IX. appointed Mgr. *Hassun* Patriarch, who, after a fruitless attempt to have his authority recognized by the Armenians of Turkey, except those of Constantinople, who are obedient to the Holy See, returned to Rome in July, 1872.

Abdul Medshid, on his accession to power, yielding to the representations of the European Cabinets, promised, in an official document, dated November 3, 1839, to ameliorate the condition of the Christians; but his good intentions were rendered nugatory by the fanaticism of the Turks. By the *Hatti-Humayum,* or Edict of Toleration, issued in 1856, at the close of the war against Russia, the Sultan granted to the Christians equal rights with his Moslem subjects, including the right to bear arms and to appear on equal terms in the courts of justice; but, in matter of fact, the Christians were no better off than they had been before the Edict was issued, as is abundantly established by the fact that a frightful massacre of the Christians took place on Mt. Libanus in July, 1860,[2] and in Bulgaria in 1876. The self-sacrificing devotion of the Sisters of Charity in caring for the soldiers wounded in the war of 1855 against Russia, elicited even at Constantinople a sympathetic admiration for their heroism. It was hoped that the visit of the Sultan to the World's Fair at *Paris,* in 1867, and subsequently to the Courts of *London* and *Vienna,* and his conference with the King of Prussia, at Coblentz, would enlarge his views and expand his sympathies, and that the result of these influences would be visible in the civilization of Turkey and the more humane treatment of his Christian subjects. If these blessings are ever to come upon Turkey, they will be due mainly to the great labours of the Lazarists, the Sisters of Charity, and the Christian Brothers, who have opened *schools* all over the country. The main hope of the Christians for an improved condition of affairs lies in the desire of the Turks to have their children properly educated, and in the ability of the former to give such education.

But it is in *Asiatic Turkey,*[3] and particularly in the Levant, or that stretch of seacoast lying along the Mediterranean from Constantinople to Alexandria, that the Lazarists, under the protection of Austria and France, have put forth their greatest energies and gained their most splendid triumphs. The Catholic Church has a special interest in these countries, for their memories are associated in her history with some of her most cherished traditions.[4] Here, too, the schools are her chief instrument of influence, and in conducting them the Jesuits and Franciscans emulate the zeal and labours of the Lazarists. While the Capuchins were erecting schools in the apostolic vicariate of *Aleppo,* and the Sisters of Charity achieving their usual success at *Smyrna,* the Jesuits were setting up new missions in Syria.[5] Veneration for the sacred places, hallowed by scenes in the life of our Lord and his Apostles, was revived by pilgrimages to the cradle of Christianity, which were encouraged and aided by the French and Austrian Governments, and rendered more practicable by the foundation at Jerusalem of a Hospice for Pilgrims, the creation of the munificent generosity of the Imperial House of Hapsburg. In Egypt and Syria, where heretofore the Franciscan convents connected with the Custody of the Holy Sepulchre could barely manage to subsist, there are now numerous religious houses and institutions, amply supported by the contributions that pour in from all parts of the world.[6] Educational

---

[1] Cfr. Pius IX. as Pope and King, Vienna, 1865, pp. 177-180.

[2] Cf. *Pitzipios-Bey,* L'Orient, les réformes byzantines, Paris, 1853.

[3] **Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol XI., pp. 334-339; Vol. XII., pp. 66-74; Fr. trans., Vol. XXIV., p. 25 sq.; Vol. II., pp. 50-59. *Gams,* Vol. III., pp. 595-644.

[4] *Scholz,* A Journey between Alexandria and Syria, Lps,, 1822, p. 203.

[5] Father *Charles* of *Saint Aloysius,* L. c., pp. 72-103.

[6] At *Cologne* there was formed, on June 30, 1855, the *Association of the Holy Sepulchre,* in furtherance of the Catholic interests in the Holy Land. It has published, without interruption, since 1857, a Journal under the Title "*The Holy Land*"

establishments were opened by the Capuchins in *Egypt* and *Abyssinia*, after these countries had been detached from the apostolic vicariate of *Aleppo*, the former in 1837 and the latter in 1843. Thus is the way being noiselessly and gradually prepared for a return of the schismatical sects of the East to the Roman Catholic Church, to which they are indebted for all that dignified and ennobled their history in the past. "It cannot be denied," says *Dr. Durbin*, an American and a Protestant, "that the high degree of civilization formerly reached by these countries was wholly due to their union with the Catholic Church."[1] At present the most ardent advocates for union with Rome are the patriarch of the *Maronites*, the patriarch of the *Melchite Greeks*, the patriarch of the *Syrians*, the patriarch of the *Armenians* in Cilicia and Mesopotamia, and the patriarch of the *Chaldeans*. The condition of the Island of Cyprus, which once possessed three hundred churches, and has now only four thousand Catholics, is by no means encouraging.

While the Catholic missions of Palestine, poor in the wealth of the world, but rich in the zeal and love of God, are accomplishing such great things, the *Anglo-Prussian episcopal see of St. James* of Jerusalem,[2] with an endowment of 120,000 gilders a year, does not possess a single parish. The general look of contentment and ease, which strike everyone as characteristic of the household of the bishop and the attachées of the mission and which are in such striking contrast with the squalor and poverty of the population, in whose spiritual interest the members of this expensive establishment are supposed to be working, leaves the reluctant impression upon the minds even of Protestants that the whole enterprise is a sort of "religious luxury."

In *Persia* the Catholic missionaries, and notably the *French Lazarists* are active and zealous, and, by the purity of their lives and their disregard of worldly wealth and conveniences, have gained the respect and extorted the admiration even of the disciples of Mohammed; while, on the other hand, the American Protestant missionaries, supplied from Boston with almost unlimited amounts of money, which they lavishly distribute among the inhabitants, have made comparatively small progress.[3] In 1834, the Shah of Persia issued a firman, securing *Father Deuberia*, Superior of the Armenian Mission, against molestation or vexatious interference.[4]

A College for Foreign Missions has been erected in Western Persia, with funds supplied from Lyons, by *Eugene Boré*, who has been instrumental in bringing many other blessings upon the country. Through the influence of France, the Catholics of Persia have had many of their churches restored. There is a small but faithful community of Catholics at *Kerak*, not far from the Dead Sea, in Arabia, for whom a church sufficiently large for their accommodation was built in 1848.

II. INDIA MISSIONS.

In *East India*[5] the first bishopric was established at *Goa*, in 1534, and raised to an archbishopric in 1557, with *Cochin*, *Cranganore*, and *Meliapoor* in Hither India, *Malacca* in the Malay Peninsula, and *Macao* in China, as suffragan sees. The controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans relative to the *Malabar Customs*, which was decided adversely to the former by the Papal Legate, Tournon, in 1704, and again by Pope Benedict XIV., July 21, 1742, interrupted the harmonious relations previously existing between these two great Orders; and the subsequent suppression of the Society of Jesus, while it was not without some retarding influence upon the missions under its charge, did not perceptibly stay their progress. From the year 1673 onwards *John de Britto*, a son of the Viceroy of Brazil, and his companions followed in the footsteps of Francis Xavier, and, like him, were endowed with the gift of miracles. *Francis Lainez*, during an apostolate of above thirty years, converted more than fifty thousand idolaters. The Indian Missions continued in a flourishing condition until 1760, when they ceased to exist, in consequence of the removal of the Jesuits by the Government of Portugal. After the power of Portugal had declined and the English Company had established its authority in East India, Popes *Alexander VII.* and *Innocent XII.* sent thither apostolic vicars, and an apostolic vicariate was permanently fixed at *Bombay*. Thereupon the officers of the East India

---

[1] Observations in the East, by *John P. Durbin*, Vol. II., pp. 287, 527.

[2] Cf. *Hefele*, Supplem. of Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 477; Dr. *Braun*, Jerusalem, 2nd ed., p. 215, Freiburg, 1867.

[3] *Marshall*, Christian Missions, Vol. II., p. 121. (Tr.)

[4] *Hœnighaus*, Cath. Eccl. Gaz., nro. 80, and the text of the Letter, nro. 88.

[5] *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 608; *Müllbauer*, The Catholic Missions in East India.

Company, by an order of the 7th of August, 1791, forbade the Archbishop of Goa to exercise any authority over the Catholics of Bombay. The sees of Cranganore, Cochin, and Meliapoor, situated within the territory occupied by the Company, after falling vacant, were not again filled, because Portugal, having the right of presentation, would not exercise it now that the country was in the hands of the English. In 1832 the Holy See warned the Court of Lisbon that the appointments must be made or the privilege *formally* abdicated, and receiving no answer, established (1834-'37), with the concurrence of the English Government, apostolic vicariates at *Calcutta*, *Madras*, *Madura*, and on the island of *Ceylon*. The Chapter of Goa protested against the action of the Holy See, forbade anyone, under pain of excommunication, to hold intercourse with the Apostolic Delegate, and encouraged the priests of Goa to oppose the missionaries who remained obedient to Rome, thus creating a schism, which *Joseph de Sylva y Torrès*, nominated by the Chapter in 1843, and upon the most solemn pledges of keeping the peace, confirmed by Gregory XVI. Archbishop of Goa, was to perpetuate. A facile instrument in the hands of the schismatical clergy, and a vehement advocate of the claims of the Court of Lisbon, the new archbishop at once conferred priests' orders on eight hundred illiterate men, who went up and down through the vicariates with the diabolical purpose of doing all the mischief they could, and really succeeded in driving about 240,000 Catholics into schism. After a protracted negotiation with the Cabinet of Lisbon, Pius IX. finally had Sylva y Torrès called home from Goa. But, in total disregard of the Pope's Allocution of February 17, 1851, Anthony Maria Suarez, styling himself Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Goa, at Bombay, encouraged by De Matta, Bishop of Macao, did his best to perpetuate the schism. For resisting the attempts of the latter, *Anastasius Hartmann*, Vicar-Apostolic of Patna and Administrator of Bombay, was forced to take refuge in a church from the fury of the schismatics, where, being shut up from the 13th to the 20th of March, 1853, he nearly died of starvation. And when Pius IX., on the 8th of the following May, threatened the unworthy Bishop of Macao with the censures of the Church, the outcry against Rome in the Portuguese Chamber grew so violent that the Papal Nuncio was on the point of quitting the country. The negotiations between Rome and the Court of Lisbon, relative to the Goa schism, were brought to a satisfactory close in 1859.

Besides the episcopal sees in the ecclesiastical province of *Goa* (viz., *Cochin*, *Meliapoor*, and *Malacca*), there are numerous apostolic vicariates in India, viz.: In *Hither India*, those of *Agra*, *Bombay*—divided into two districts, *Northern* and *Southern*—*Mangalore*, *Mysore*, *Coimbatoor*, *Verapoli*, *Quilon*, *Colombo*, *Jafnanapatam*, *Madura*, *Pondichery*, *Madras*, *Hyderabad*, *Vizagapatam*, *Patna*, *Western* and *Eastern Bengal*, with residences respectively at Calcutta and Dacca, and the apostolic prefecture of *Central Bengal*. In *Farther India*, those of *Eastern*, *Northern*, and *Southern Burmah*; and in the island of Java, a dependency of Holland, that of *Batavia*. The suppression of the Jesuits, the schism of Goa, and the revolt against the English, in 1857, all contributed, at different times and each in its own way, to retard, without, however, wholly obstructing the spread of Catholicity in these missionary lands. Had not the Jesuits been suppressed, it is probable, as a Protestant writer tells us,[1] that they would have succeeded in converting, not only the whole of India, but China also; and even after these missions had been abandoned for above fifty years (1760 to 1820), the missionaries, who returned at the end of that time, were astonished to find more than a million, or, including the schismatics of Goa, *over twelve hundred thousand* still fervently attached to the faith that had been preached to their fathers. And not only has the Church held her own in these lands. It is shown by statistical reports that the churches founded by St. Francis Xavier and his successors receive some thousands of converts annually. In 1859, five thousand schismatics were reconciled to the Church, and nine hundred idolators and Protestants converted in the vicariate of Madura alone, and, in 1875, the total number of conversions in the eighteen vicariates of Hither India was above ten thousand.[2] There were, in 1859, forty-three Jesuits in these missions, a number of colleges and schools for educating priests and training catechists, five orphanages, three hospitals, besides convents of Carmelite and Franciscan nuns.

III. MISSIONS OF CHINA AND THE ADJACENT TERRITORIES.

In *Farther India*, including Burmah, Siam, Annam, together with Tungking, Cochin China, &c., the apostolic vicariates of *Pegue* and *Ava*, which had been established in 1744 for the Empire of *Burmah*, had been long vacant and the missions long deserted for lack

[1] Mr. George Campbell, quoted by *Marshall*, Christian Missions, Vol. I., p. 245 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Catholic Missions*, Freiburg, 1877, p. 68. (Tr.)

of labourers, when *Pius VII.* came to the pontifical throne. A new vicar was appointed by him, and the mission given in charge to the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary at Turin. In 1848, there were 4,000 Christians in the mission of Burmah out of a population of 9,000,000. The apostolic vicariate of West Siam, to which portions of that of Pegue and Ava have been annexed, has been quite recently established. For many years *Pallegoix*, Apostolic-Vicar and Bishop of Mallos, laboured zealously in the Kingdom of Siam, and, after great efforts to overcome the aversion of the natives to Christianity, finally succeeded in converting about 7,000 of them. In the mission of *East-Siam* there is a seminary, situated at *Bangkok*, in which young men are educated for the priesthood. In 1854 there were thirty seminarists in this institution. There are also several primary schools in the mission, besides four convents of females, belonging to the Congregation of the Servants of the Mother of God, who are wholly devoted to the work of instructing children and catechumens of their own sex.

In *Annam* and *Cochin-China* the missions are more promising, notwithstanding the fact that, after the accession of *Min-Menh*, in 1820, the Christians there passed through one of the most ferocious persecutions ever waged in any age or country. During the twenty years that this persecution lasted they displayed all the heroism of the early martyrs of the Church, and their numbers steadily increased until it reached one hundred thousand. The Christian world learned of these events with feelings of mingled joy and sorrow from an allocution, published by Gregory XVI. on the 27th of April, 1840.

During the short reign of *Tieu-Tri* († 1847) the violence of the persecution somewhat abated, owing mainly to the fear inspired by the thunders of English cannon along the coast of China and to the success of the French naval commander, Lapierre, who, in the space of an hour, utterly annihilated the fleet of Cochin-China.

The persecutions were renewed under his successor, *Tu-duc*. In 1850 the Christian inhabitants of the village of Ly-tou-pa, numbering two hundred and forty, were inhumanly tortured because they would not consent to give up their faith. In 1851 Father *Duchos* died in prison; Father *Augustine Schaeffler*, a French priest from Nancy, was beheaded in the same year; and Father *Bonnard* on the 1st of May of the following year. Above 9,500 Christians were carried off by the cholera in 1851, but their loss was more than compensated by fresh accessions.

Unfortunately, the appearance of a French man-of-war outside the harbour of *Turon*, in 1857, had the effect of making the King of *Annam* suspicious of his Christian subjects, whose lot grew daily more intolerable, until finally, after the departure of the vessel, a general persecution broke out against them in 1858. There was hardly a habitation that had sheltered a Christian left standing, and schools, seminaries, convents, and houses of religious were all destroyed. Still the missionaries held their ground, and after the storm had gone by, again began work. Thanks to their courage, zeal, and activity, numbers of adults are being now daily baptized. According to the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,[1] there were in *Annam*, in 1858, in spite of the martyrdoms, fourteen bishops, besides above thirty in China Proper, sixty European and two hundred and forty native priests, sixteen undred native female religious, and five hundred and thirty thousand Christians.

In *Tibet*, Horatio della Penna was partially successful in evangelizing the natives. In 1744, when he and his brethren were expelled the country, they passed over into the Empire of the Great Mogul of India. The apostolic vicariate of Tibet and Gyra was established in 1808, and placed under the direction of the Capuchins. In the years 1845 and 1846 the Lazarists, *Huc* and *Gabet*, penetrated into Tibet as far as Lassa, where they made many converts, but were subsequently ordered to quit the country, in consequence of a demand made to the Tibetan authorities by the resident ambassador of China. Another attempt was made, in 1851 and 1852, to enter the country from the Indian side of the Himalayah mountains, but the courageous missionaries were seized and put to death before they had succeeded in making any conversions.

When *Joseph Maria Chauveau* was appointed apostolic vicar for Tibet, in September, 1864, a fresh persecution broke out against the Christians, during which many died for their faith.

In *China Proper*[2] the condition of the Christians varied with the opinions of the reigning monarch. Towards the close of the reign of *Keen-lung* (1735-1795) the missionaries

---

[1] No. 119.

[2] *Gams*, Vol. I., p. 196 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 41, Pen-pictures and Sketches of China, five articles; Cf., especially, p. 1049 sq.

were taken into favour; during the early days of the reign of his successor, *Kea-king* (1795-1820), they were agitated with alternate hopes and misgivings; but, as time went on, the emperor, yielding to the solicitations of the mandarins, began a violent persecution against the Christians. According to the testimony of *Gützlaff*, a Protestant missionary, who died in 1851, "thousands of Catholics perished by the axe of the executioner." The persecution was at its worst in 1815, when the apostolic vicar, *Dufresse*, after forty years (1776-1815) of fruitful missionary work, died the death of a martyr and a saint, September 14, 1815. In an allocution of September 23 of the following year, Pius VII. took occasion to speak of him in terms of the highest praise.

Father *Clet*, a Lazarist, at the advanced age of seventy-two, and Father *Chen*, a native of China, together with a number of laymen, like Dufresse, suffered martyrdom, confessing their faith. Apart from some vexatious annoyances from the mandarins, the Christians enjoyed a season of comparative quiet during the reign of *Taou-Kwang*, from 1820 till 1850. In 1839, however, the French missionary, *Perboyre*, after having seen five Christians beheaded before his eyes, was subjected to the most inhuman torments, and finally put to death in the province of Hoo-pih. His three brothers, who had remained at home, being also desirous of winning the crown of martyrdom, set out for China, after having received the news of their brother's death. While these events were taking place, the first Anglo-Chinese Opium war broke out, resulting, in 1842, in the *Treaty of Nanking*, by which the "Son of Heaven" bound himself to pay to the "Red-whiskered Barbarians," as he called the English, a war indemnity of $21,000,000, and to open, besides the port of Canton, those of Amoy, Fuh-chow-Foo, Ningpo, and Shanghai to foreign trade.

On the joint demand of France and the United States, a promise was given that native Christians should not be molested; that foreigners should be allowed to build churches and chapels in five of the sea-port cities; and that missionaries in the interior, if seized, should be delivered up to the nearest French Consul. This was a virtual abdication of the Chinese principle of exclusion. On the accession of *Heen-fung*, February 5, 1850, the old Chinese party again rallied, and urged upon the new emperor the necessity of setting aside the Treaty of Nanking and of assuming an aggressive attitude towards foreigners. After a long succession of intrigues, secretly carried on against the English, open hostilities finally broke out in Canton in October, 1856. As the Chinese had also broke faith with France by the murder of Père *Chapdelaine* in the same year, the latter country at once united with England in demanding satisfaction. Canton was stormed, and yielded after a feeble resistance, in 1857; and the allied forces, ascending the rivers in light boats, penetrated into the interior of the country. The emperor was forced to conclude a treaty of peace, the articles of which are thus described by Baron Gros, the French Plenipotentiary, writing to his government, under date of July 19, 1858:—"The vast empire of China," said he, "is open to Christianity, and nearly the whole of it to the industry and commerce of the West. Our diplomatic agents will reside, as occasion may require, at Peking, and *our missionaries have leave to go all over the empire.* A Chinese ambassador will be sent to Paris, and the laws against the Christians will be abrogated." This treaty, though fenced about with every sort of diplomatic formality, was not carried into execution, and, in consequence, France and England again, in December, 1859, began hostilities, which resulted in the capture of *Peking* and the signing of the Treaty of Tien-tsin, October 24, 1860. It was stipulated that the articles of the Treaty of 1858 should be enforced; that certain other concessions, besides those there provided for, should be granted to the Christians; that a war indemnity of 8,000,000 of taels should be paid to the allied powers; and that some valuable privileges should be accorded to France. The Catholics, besides having a cathedral and four churches restored to them at *Peking*, were permitted to build another at *Canton*, the corner-stone of which was brought from Jerusalem. The tyrannical and voluptuous *Heen-fung* died shortly after the conclusion of the Treaty, in the summer of the following year, leaving the throne to his son *Tung-che*, then only five years of age. Tung-che having died without issue, January 12, 1875, the succession passed from the direct line of the Tsing dynasty. His cousin, then not quite four years of age, was chosen in his room, under the title of Kwang-seu, or "Succession of Glory."[1] The government was temporarily vested in two women of singular moderation and prudence. Still persecutions did not entirely cease in the provinces, but the instances that occurred were the work of officials, and had not either the sanction or the sympathy of the Government. Quite the contrary. In 1862 a high official was dismissed because he had been implicated in the murder of Abbé *Néel* a missionary in Kwei-Chow, and his

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, London and Philadelphia, 1877, art. China. (Tr.)

four lay assistants, on the 17th of February. The Chinese general, Tien-ta-jen, a disreputable character, who subsequently fell into disgrace, affecting to regard as rebels the numerous disciples of the Abbé Néel, whom his bishop, Mgr. *Faurie*, called a saint, instigated the mandarin, Tay-lou-tche, to put them to death. During each successive year since 1850, Europeans and natives, priests and laymen, men and women, have cheerfully offered ther lives in witness of the truth of their faith. Of the native priests, Andrew Koung, Superior of the College of Hoo-pih, perished in 1852; Father Philip Minh, in 1853; Father Huong, in 1856; and Father Paul Tinh and another, in 1857. On the 31st of January of the last-named year, remarkable for the great number of martyrs it gave to the Church, four Christians were beheaded, on the day following eleven, and two days later ten, all in the same town. The executions continued during the following months of April and May, and on the 20th of July, Bishop *Diaz*, a Spaniard, was beheaded, after a long and fruitful career as a missionary. His head was recovered, in 1858, by some fishermen, and brought to Bishop *Melchior*, who was himself shortly to undergo a still more terrible fate, being literally hacked to pieces. From the days of Ricci to the present the history of Catholicity in China has been one of persecution, fidelity, and martyrdom.

There are at present twenty-two apostolic vicariates in China Proper, viz., *Kwang-tung, Fuh-Keen, Che-Keang, Kiang-su, Northern, Eastern*, and *South-eastern Chili, Hoo-nan, Northern, Eastern, Western*, and *South-western Hoo-pieh, Nanking, Keang-se, Kwang-se, Yun-nan, Kwei-chow, Northern, Southern, Eastern*, and *Western Sze-chuen*, and *Hong-Kong*. There are also three apostolic prefectures, viz., *Hai-nan, Kwang-tung*, and *Kwang-se*. There are many apostolic vicariates in the neighbouring territories. To the South, in *Indo-China* or *Farther India*, the following: *Eastern* and *Western Siam, Camboja, Western, Eastern*, and *Northern Annam* or *Cochin-China*, and *Central, Southern*, and *Western Tung-king*; and to the North, *Corea, Japan, Manchooria, Mongolia, Tibet*, and, finally, the apostolic prefecture of the *French Colonies* in East India. There were in the whole of the Celestial Empire, in 1859, 196 European priests and 428 of native birth, besides eighteen Catholic seminaries. In the year 1868 there were in China Proper 158 European and 169 Chinese priests, and a Catholic population of 325,000; but, including the dependencies, of more than a million.[1] Through the instrumentality of the "*Society of the Holy Childhood*," 359,388 Chinese children received the grace of baptism up to 1857, of whom 9,168 had been purchased; in 1875, 300,000 foundlings were baptized, 50,000 of whom survived and were brought up.

The comparatively unknown Peninsula of *Corea*, into which Catholic missionaries had penetrated as early as 1632, and where they have been labouring ever since, forms in itself an isolated apostolic vicariate. There is no country of the world in which the Church has had as many martyrs in modern times as in this. *Alexis Houng the Young*, suspected of favouring a policy which would open the country to missionaries, was put to death, May 21, 1801, after having borne up under frightful tortures, his last words being: "I die for the religion of the Lord of Heaven." Being almost entirely destitute of priests, the Coreans made a most piteous appeal to Pope Pius VII. and the bishops of the Catholic world to come to their relief. "We beg of you," they said, "in virtue of the merits of our martyrs, to send us priests at once; we make the request with tears of blood in our eyes." In Corea a persecution broke out simultaneously with that of China. In the interval between April and December, 1839, Bishop *Imbert*, his two brothers, and above a hundred native Christians of both sexes, suffered martyrdom; and in the short space of forty years three hundred martyrs died, confessing the faith, in the Peninsula.

After the persecution had ceased, the Christians enjoyed a few years of comparative quiet, and in 1859 there were 16,000 Catholics in the country. A fresh persecution broke out in 1866, in the course of which Bishop *Verneux*, his coadjutor, and many priests were martyred.

From the year 1596 the Catholics of Japan passed through a half a century of almost uninterrupted persecution, in the course of which they endured tortures, to which for refined, malignant, and inhuman cruelty, those borne by the early martyrs of the Church cannot be compared. Such was the feeling of distrust entertained by the Japanese for Europeans, after this persecution, that nearly the whole country was closed against them. The Dutch alone, impelled by lust of gain, purchased on the most humiliating terms the privilege of remaining in the country and keeping possession of their manufacturing establishments on the island of Desima, near the city of *Nangasaki*. It was not until after the

---

[1] Cf. The *Madras Catholic Almanac* of 1868 and the *Gerarchia Cattolica*, Rome, 1877. (Tr.)

naval expedition, sent out by the United States in 1858, had taught the Japanese a lesson, that the Government of the Mikado consented to conclude a treaty with that country, which was followed by others with England and the continental nations, opening the great city of Nangasaki and the smaller towns of Simoda and Hokadadi to foreigners. A Catholic church was erected in 1862 at Yokahama by *Gérard*, the apostolic prefect. It is hoped that the recent visit of the Japanese Embassy to the great cities of North America and the capitals of Europe will have the effect of inspiring a more generous policy towards the Christians of the Island-Empire, which is now an apostolic vicariate.

It would seem that after so long an eclipse, a new light has dawned upon AFRICA, once the nursery of great Doctors of the Church. The new see of Algiers received its first incumbent, Mgr. *Dupuch*, January 5, 1839, but the first considerable progress was reported by his successor, Mgr. *Pavey*, in 1854. Gregory XVI. paid a very fitting and delicate tribute to the revived African Church, and one, too, well calculated to awaken the memories of its past greatness, when he presented its first bishop, Mgr. Dupuch, with a valuable relic of St. Augustine, which was translated from Toulon to Hippo, on the 24th of October, 1842, by seven bishops, with unusual pomp and ceremony, and deposited in a church of the city, in which the great African Doctor shut himself up to die, with the shouts of the barbarian invaders of his country, ringing in his ears. In 1867, during the incumbency of Mgr. *Lavigerie*, *Algiers*, at the request of Napoleon III., was raised to the rank of an archbishopric, with *Oran* and *Constantine* as suffragan sees. The bishopric of *Ceuta* has been established for Fez and Morocco, containing about 14,000 Catholics, of whom 8,000 reside in the episcopal city. The recent victories of the Spaniards have had the effect of materially improving their condition. In *Tunis*, where there are at present 3,000 Catholics, an apostolic prefecture was established, in 1634, by Urban VIII., which was raised to the rank of an apostolic vicariate by Gregory XVI., March 21, 1843, with Fidelis Sutter, a Capuchin, as incumbent.

Egypt and *Arabia*, formerly attached to the Custody of the Holy Land, were erected into a separate apostolic vicariate in 1837, with the seat at Alexandria. *Perpetuus Guasco*, a Franciscan, was the first incumbent. The *Franciscans*, of whom there are about seventy in these missions, have convents at Cairo, Rosetta, Damietta, Fayoom, Alexandria, and other cities, and through their zeal many Coptic Christians have been reconciled to the Holy See. The Catholic population of the vicariate is nearly 15,000, of whom 7,000 reside at Alexandria, and religious institutions are comparatively numerous and are daily on the increase. The Franciscans are assisted in their labours by the *Lazarists*, the *Sisters of Charity*, and the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd*. These devoted women have the direction of schools, workhouses, and houses of refuge, and, owing to the epidemics with which the country is so frequently visited, at times endure extreme privation.

Abyssinia, which constituted an apostolic prefecture until 1847, when it was raised to the rank of an apostolic vicariate, contains a number of flourishing missions, mainly due to the zeal of the Lazarists and to the protection of France. *Justinus de Jacobis*, a man eminent for piety and learning, was appointed the first vicar, and from this time forth many native priests asked to be received into the Church. Since the incursion of the *Gallas*, in the sixteenth century, the ancient Empire of Abyssinia, though temporarily united in recent times during the reign of the unfortunate Emperor *Theodorus*, has been split up into the three virtually independent kingdoms of Amhara, Tigré, and Shoa. The schismatical Abyssinians would long since have entered the Church, if not deterred by their *Abuna* or Metropolitan, and forcibly prevented by the Moslems. There are prosperous missions, in spite of adverse circumstances, at *Keren* and *Massowah*. In 1859, *Ubyé*, King of Tigré, dispatched an embassy to Rome to make his submission to the Holy See, and, in consequence, above 10,000 Abyssinians, including many eminent ecclesiastics, abjured their schism, and yielded obedience to the Church. Among the *Gallas* and *Sidamas*, where the Capuchins are labouring earnestly, missionary stations have been established at Kafa, Guera, Gammara, and Borro, Bishop *Massaia* received the abjuration of *Teclafa* and of more than a thousand monks, over whom he ruled, and penetrated into the country as far as Sennaar and even beyond it. He consecrated a coadjutor in 1859.

Our knowledge of *Central Africa* has been largely increased in recent times through the well-known labours of Dr. *Livingston*, Captain *Speke*, Lieutenant *Cameron*, Mr. *Stanley*, Mr. *Barth*, Mr. *Schweinfurth*, and other German, English, American, and French explorers and scientists. The fidelity, courage, and endurance of these men are worthy of all praise, and the large stores of information contributed by them to the solution of the various questions concerning Africa can hardly be over-estimated. But the motives that prompt missionaries to enter the country are still higher and nobler. They go there, not to gain the praise and applause of the world, nor even, primarily at least, to add to the

stock of human knowledge, though they have done much in this field also, but to preach the Gospel and gain souls to Christ.

Gregory XVI., on the 3rd of April, 1846, shortly before his death, established an apostolic vicariate for Central Africa, according to a plan suggested by *Max Ryllo*, a Polish Jesuit. After having laboured as a missionary in Syria, and served for a time as Rector of the College of the Propaganda at Rome, Ryllo, accompanied by a brother of the Society of Jesus and four secular priests, among whom was *Dr. Knoblecher*, a native of Laibach, penetrated, in 1847, into the hitherto unknown districts of Central Africa. On the 11th of February, 1848, the band of missionaries arrived at Khartoom, the modern capital of Nubia, situated at the confluence of the White and Blue Nile, and of easy access from Europe, and resolved to make this place the seat of the new vicariate. After the death of Father Ryllo, June 17, 1849, Dr. Knoblecher, who was named his successor, unaided by the Propaganda, explored the territory along the White Nile, in search of available missionary stations, and, in 1850, hastened back to Europe to obtain priests and material aid to enable him to carry out his designs. The Imperial Court of Austria took up his project with zeal, and the *St. Mary's Society*, presided over by the aulic counsellor, *Dr. Hurter*, was founded in the interest of the new enterprise. Accompanied by five German priests, and in the most sanguine frame of mind, the pro-vicar, having returned to Khartoom, explored, on board his own vessel, the *Stella Matutina*, the White Nile as far as Gondokoro, in search of a site for a missionary station among the *Baggahri*. This was finally fixed at *Heiligenkreuz*, where many new missionaries shortly arrived from Germany, but their number was soon reduced by death. More than twenty fell victims to the insidious effects of the climate, and Dr. Knoblecher died at Naples, April 13, 1858. He was succeeded by *Dr. Kirchner*, of the diocese of Bamberg, who, desirous of locating the mission in a more healthy district, fixed upon the village of *Shellal*, near Assuan, on the confines of Egypt and Nubia. With a view to providing for the mission a sufficient and unfailing number of missionaries, he had it transferred by the Propaganda, in 1861, to the *Franciscans*. Rheinthaler, O.S.F., the new pro-vicar, with thirty-two members of his Order, took charge of the missions, but fell a victim to his zeal in 1862.

By 1865 the bulk of these Franciscans had likewise perished, and it was found necessary to give up the stations, with the exception of Khartoom, where two fathers and one brother remained. More than forty missionaries had been cut off by disease, even before they had acquired a sufficient familiarity with the language of the country to enable them to make themselves useful. But, if they accomplished little permanent good for religion during their short stay in Central Africa, they made very valuable contributions to science. The names of Knoblecher, Duryak, Beltrame, Morlang, Vinco, Kaufmann, Kirchner, Gossner, and Mosgan will ever find a place among the most eminent of African explorers; and their voyages of discovery, their accurate geographical researches, their meteorological observations, and their ethnographical and linguistic studies, have added vastly to the stock of knowledge concerning the Nile regions and their inhabitants. Although ten years elapsed before another pro-vicar was appointed to the African missions, they did not become wholly extinct. In 1854 two institutions were founded at Naples by Ludovico di Casoria, the one for boys and the other for girls, where children were brought at proper age from Khartoom to be educated and again sent back to labour for the salvation of their countrymen and women. In 1865 sixty negro boys and one hundred negro girls were sent to the house of the Propaganda at Shellal, to be distributed according to the needs of the missions.

In 1872 Don *Comboni* was appointed pro-vicar. He began work on a new plan. Seeing the paramount necessity of acclimatizing those who were to work in the missions of Central Africa, he founded a seminary at *Verona* for the education of priests and a novitiate for the training of Sisters. From this place they passed over to Fostat, in the neighbourhood of *Cairo*, where they assumed the direction of schools, and after a sufficient time spent there went to the interior. The first of these devoted bands, under the guidance of *Don Carcereri*, settled at *El Obeid*, the capital of Kordofan, in 1872. In 1873 Comboni conducted from Europe to Khartoom a colony of forty persons, eighteen of whom were Sisters of St. Joseph, all native Africans and Asiatics. In 1874 Comboni divided his vicariate into two districts, Northern and Southern, and, in 1875, intrusted the former, including the provinces of *Berber*, in Upper Nubia; *Suakin*, on the shores of the Red Sea; and *Taka*, on the northern frontier of Abyssinia, to the *Camillists;* while he kept the latter, including the former kingdom of *Dongola*, for himself. He was consecrated bishop in 1877, and appointed vicar-apostolic of Central Africa.[1]

[1] *Freiburg Cath. Eccl. Gazette*, 1858, p. 154 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 39, pp.

Although the *Cape of Good Hope* had been rounded by the Portuguese in the fifteenth century, it was not colonized until the seventeenth, when the *Dutch Boers* settled there. They were followed by some French Huguenots, and Calvinism became the prevailing religion of the Colony. In 1806 Cape Colony passed under British rule, and shortly afterwards Catholic missionaries began to find their way into it. Previously to 1847 the Church there was under the jurisdiction of the Vicar-Apostolic of Mauritius or Isle de France, but in that year an apostolic vicariate was established, its first incumbent being Mgr. *Griffith*, who took up his residence at *Grahamstown*. The number of Catholics increased so rapidly that it was found necessary, in 1851, to divide the Colony into *two districts, Eastern* and *Western;* and, in 1874, to establish the *Apostolic Prefecture of Central Capeland*, with the seat at *Georgetown*, which embraced a portion of what was formerly, the Western District. St. Aidan's College, under the direction of the Society of Jesus, was opened at Grahamstown on the 31st of January, 1876.[1]

Little, if any, progress has been made in the missions of *Guinea, Senegambia,* and *Madagascar*. Of seventy-five missionaries, belonging to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, sent to the Guinea missions within an interval of eleven years, forty-two either died prematurely or were rendered unfit for service by sickness. It became apparent that the only hope of achieving permanent success lay in the education of native priests, and, in consequence, a seminary was founded for this purpose at Lyons, in 1854. An apostolic vicariate was established for Senegambia in the same year; and on the 28th of August, 1860, another was established for *Sierra Leone*, and a third for *Dahomey*, the seat of the latter being at *Agbomey*. *Guinea, Natal*, and *Madagascar* have each an apostolic vicariate; and Tripoli, Senegal, Saharra, the Islands of Annobon, Corisco, Fernando Po in the Bight of Biafra, Congo, Central Capeland, Nossibé, Ste. Marie, Mayotte and Comorro Islands, and Zanzibar, have each an apostolic prefecture.[2]

IV. AMERICAN MISSIONS.

The Church in America is full of life and activity, and is daily gaining fresh triumphs. In spite of the reverses sustained in the last century, her growth has been rapid and steady. On this Continent there are 177 bishoprics, 15 apostolic vicariates, and 4 apostolic prefectures, the Catholic population being about 55,000,000.[3]

In the year 1831 the sachems of the Algonquins and Iroquois sent to the Holy Father, some articles made with their own hands, accompanied with the following touching letter: "Thou art the Shepherd of all the faithful; thou hast taught us to know Jesus Christ: thou didst send us the men of the black robe, saying to them, 'Go, seek the Indians; they are my children; help and assist them.' Thou art our Father, and we will never acknowledge any other. Should our descendants forget thee and lapse into error, show them these gifts, and they will return to thee." In spite of the difficulties naturally growing out of the suspicion with which the English Government of Canada has regarded the Church, the Indians of the Province of Quebec are entirely Catholic; while in the Province of Ontario there are also many considerable Catholic communities among them. The bishops, apostolic vicars, and missionaries engaged in these countries displayed so great zeal and were so successful in their labours that Gregory XVI., by a bull dated July 12, 1844, united all the dioceses of Upper and Lower Canada in one province, in which were included the metropolitan see of *Quebec*, established in 1674, and the suffragan sees of *Kingston, Montreal*, and *Toronto*, established respectively in 1826, 1836, and 1842. To these were added, as time went on, those of *St. Boniface* (1842), *Ottawa* (1848), *Three Rivers* (1852), *St. Hyacinth* (1852), *London* (1856), *Hamilton* (1856), *St. Albert's* (1859),

---

372 sq., 601 sq., 653 sq., 666 sq. The Cologne and Munich Annals of the Propagation of the Faith; *The Catholic Missions*, Freiburg and St. Louis, year 1873, pp. 62 and 92; year 1876, p. 87. A Full Report, in 1867, of the African Institutes of Egypt, established by Daniel Comboni, Vienna, 1871. (Tr.)

[1] *Catholic Missions*, 1876, pp. 22 and 169 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, 1877, pp. 61, 62. (Tr.)

[3] For statistics, consult *Cath. Almanac* of 1878; *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1877. For general information, see *Wittmann*, L. c., Vol. I., pp. 18-253; *Henrion* and *Hahn*. For details concerning special countries, consult the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopæd.*, Vol. XII., pp. 34-50; Fr. tr., Vol. 1, pp. 235-288. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. III., pp. 644-674. *O'Kane Murray*, Ch. H. of the U. S.; 5th ed., New York, 1877. *Lembke*, O.S.B., Life and Labours of Prince Gallitzin, being a Supplement to the Hist. of Cath. Missions in North America (1799-1840), Münster, 1861.

Saint-Germain of *Rimouski* (1867), and the apostolic vicariates of Athabaska-Mackenzie (1853), and British Columbia (1863.)

In 1870 a second province was formed, with *Toronto* as the metropolitan see, and Kingston, Hamilton, London, and the apostolic vicariate of Northern Canada (established 1874), in the Province of Ontario, as suffragans. A third province, that of *St. Boniface*, was formed in 1871, including the archiepiscopal see of St. Boniface, the diocese of *St. Albert*, and the apostolic vicariates of Athabaska-Mackenzie and British Columbia.

Halifax was created a bishopric in 1843 and an archbishopric in 1852, with *Charlottetown*, P. E. Island (1832); *St. John's*, N.B. (1842); *Arichat*, with seat at *Antigonish* (1844); and *Chatham*, N. B. (1860), as suffragan sees; the dioceses of *St. John's* and *Harbor Grace*, Newfoundland, being directly subject to the Holy See. By a decree dated September 17, 1871, the western portion of the island of Newfoundland was made an apostolic prefecture, called *St. George*. The French islands, *St. Pierre* and *Miquelon*, off the Southern coast of Newfoundland, form likewise an apostolic prefecture.

Father *Burke* laboured with eminent success as a missionary for twenty years in what is now the *Province of Halifax*. He died in 1827, and was succeeded in the direction of the mission by Rev. *William Frazer* (1821-1840) and *William Walsh*, the first Archbishop of Halifax. His successor was the Most Rev. *Thomas L. Conolly*, consecrated Bishop of St. John's, N. B., in 1852, and transferred to Halifax in 1859. He was succeeded in 1877 by the present archbishop, Most Rev. *Michael Hannan*. The diocese of *Vancouver's Island* belongs to the Province of Oregon, in the United States. Its bishop, Mgr. *Seghers*, who has also charge of *Alaska*, sailed up the river Yukon in July, 1877, as far as Nulato, in search of a suitable position for a missionary station.

There is probably no country of the world in which the Church is making such rapid progress as in the *United States of North America*. There are, it is true, Protestant sects, representing almost every form of belief, and even every shade of thought of which the human mind is capable; but as for any definite and fixed religious system, held consistently and uniformly by a large body of men from supernatural motives, there is none. The multitudinous and varied sects of Protestantism prove conclusively that as a systematic body of religious teaching it has ceased, and ceased for ever, to exercise any beneficial influence over the minds of men, and that as an organization it has literally gone to pieces. True, there are many churches under ostensibly the same denominational title, but every American knows that no two of their ministers believe or teach the same doctrines, and that the minds of the hearers, if not completely indifferent or thoroughly saturated with infidelity, are still more hopelessly confused than those of their so-called teachers. Protestantism in the United States, except in a few isolated cases, has lost all positive religious meaning, unless man-worship be received as a truth revealed of God. Anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with non-Catholic society in the United States will bear us out when we say that it is the *preacher*, and not the *teaching*, that constitutes the attraction of the various Protestant churches, and particularly of those known as the fashionable churches of the cities and larger towns. There is, however, one office which those professing to represent Protestantism perform with creditable zeal and consistency—they keep alive the anti-Catholic prejudice. The Catholic Church has been so long shut out from all influence in countries where the English language is spoken, that, not only the religious, but the political, social, and professional traditions of these countries have grown hostile to her and suspicious of her claims. The very literature is poisoned with this ubiquitous and all-pervading tradition. No historical controversy is carried on without an appeal being made to it: no politico-religious question is discussed without reference to some exceptional fact in history, coloured by succeeding generations of writers under the influence of the same tradition. It has now ceased to be distinctively Protestant, because Protestantism is no more; it has become the heritage of English institutions and of English literature, and will be as difficult to remove as the malaria from the atmosphere of the Roman Campagna. The minds of the bulk of English-speaking people are still sensitive of the claims of the Church, and to irritate this sensibility is the office those professing to teach Protestantism are most intent upon performing. But the negative and disintegrating character of Protestantism, while it is deplorable as a phase of religious life, serves to throw the unity, the majesty, and the perpetuity of the Catholic Church into bolder relief in the United States. The following statistics will serve to give, at least in outline, some idea of the extraordinary growth of the Church in this portion of North America:—

In *New Mexico*, which has been a portion of the United States since 1840, the bishopric of *Santa Fé*, established in 1850, was raised to the rank of an archbishopric in 1875, and includes the apostolic vicariates of *Colorado* (1868) and *Arizona* (1869). The number of Catholics, which is rapidly on the increase, is at present about 110,000, of whom 8,000 are Pueblo Indians (that is, dwelling in villages), 1,000 native Americans, and the rest

Mexicans. The Christian Brothers have a college at Santa Fé, and the Society of Jesus another at *Las Vegas*, the professors of which conduct the *Revista Catolica* newspaper.

In *Texas* the mission of *San Antonio* was founded above a century and a half ago by the Franciscans, who were expelled the country in 1812, and when they returned in 1840 found only 10,000 Catholics of the 130,000 they had left behind them. The apostolic vicariate of Texas, established in 1840, became the bishopric of *Galveston* in 1847, and in 1874 was divided into the bishopric of *San Antonio* and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville*. The first incumbent of the see of Galveston was Mgr. *Odin*, who made several voyages to Europe in the interest of his diocese, and brought back with him a number of zealous priests, ready to share his labours. The missions of Father *Weninger*, S.J., have been here, as elsewhere in the United States, remarkably successful in reviving fervour of religious life among the Catholics. The Lazarists, the Oblates of the Immaculate Conception, the Benedictines, the Brothers of Mary, the Sisters of the Incarnation, and the Ursulines have all houses in this State, and are actively at work in their several fields of labour.

Previously to the independence of the original colonies, many English Catholics, to escape penal restrictions and civil disabilities at home, immigrated thither, but their number never exceeded 25,000. During the War of Independence, they were placed under the jurisdiction of the apostolic vicariate of London, the incumbent being then the celebrated Bishop *Challoner;* but after the close of the war it was thought proper to place the United States under a distinct ecclesiastical administration, and accordingly in 1789 the see of *Baltimore* was established, and the Right Rev. *John Carroll* appointed its first bishop. The Catholic population of the United States increased rapidly, mainly through immigration from Ireland and Germany, and in 1843 was set down at 1,500,000, and is at present variously estimated, the highest number being 8,000,000, and the lowest 5,000,000. By a brief dated April 8, 1808, Pius VII. raised Baltimore to the rank of a metropolitan see, with *New Orleans* (established in 1793), *New York*, *Philadelphia*, *Boston*, and *Bardstown* (now Louisville) as suffragans. The saintly Bishop *Flaget* was the first incumbent of the last-named see. The bishopric of *Charleston*, *S. C.*, was established in 1820, and *Dr. England*, recently from Ireland, appointed its first bishop. Those of *Cincinnati* and *Richmond* were both established in 1821, the first incumbent of the former being Bishop *Fenwick*, O.S.D., and Dr. *Kelly* of the latter. *Mobile* was established in 1824; *St. Louis* in 1826: *Detroit* in 1832; *Vincennes* in 1834: *Dubuque*, *Nashville*, and *Natchez* in 1837; *San Francisco* in 1840; *Pittsburg*, *Little Rock*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Oregon* in 1843; *Chicago*, *Hartford*, and *Milwaukee* in 1844; and in 1846 Oregon was raised to the rank of an archbishopric. The sees of *Albany*, *Buffalo*, *Cleveland*, and *Galveston* were established in 1847, and *St. Louis* raised to an archbishopric in the same year, with the Most Rev. *P. R. Kenrick* as incumbent. In 1850, Pius IX., then in exile at Gaëta, raised *New York*, *Cincinnati*, and *New Orleans* to metropolitan rank, their respective incumbents being Most Rev. *John Hughes*, Most Rev. *John B. Purcell*, and Most Rev. *A. Blanc;* and at the same time established the sees of *Wheeling*, *Savannah*, and *St. Paul*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Santa Fé.* in New Mexico; transferred the episcopal see of Walla-Walla to *Nesqually*, appointed a bishop to *Montery*, in Upper California, and erected the apostolic vicariate of *Kansas*, and in the following year that of *Nebraska*.

At the request of the bishops of the United States, assembled in the first Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Holy See established, in 1853, the sees of *Brooklyn*, *Burlington*, *Covington*, *Erie*, *Natchitoches*, *Newark*, and *Portland;* and in the same year San Francisco was made an archbishopric. In 1857 the sees of *Alton*, *Saut Ste. Marie* (transferred in 1865 to *Marquette*), *Fort Wayne*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Florida* were established; and in 1868, at the suggestion of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, those of *Columbus*, *Grass Valley* (which replaced the apostolic vicariate of Marysville, established in 1861), *Green Bay*, *Harrisburg*, *La Crosse*, *Rochester*, *Scranton*, *St. Joseph's*, and *Wilmington*, together with the apostolic vicariates of *Colorado*, *North Carolina*, and *Idaho* (two districts). In 1869 the apostolic vicariate of *Arizona* (with seat at *Tucson*) was established; in 1870 the see at *Springfield;* in 1872 those of *Ogdensburg* and *Providence;* and in 1874 that of *San Antonio* and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville* (with seat at *Corpus Christi*). In 1875 the bishoprics of Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé were raised to metropolitan rank, and an apostolic vicariate given to *Northern Minnesota* (with seat at *St. Cloud*); in 1876 an apostolic prefecture was established for the *Indian Territory;* and, finally, in 1877, *Peoria* was made a bishopric, and the apostolic vicariate of *Kansas* changed into the episcopal see of *Leavenworth*.

The following is a list of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Catholic Church in the United States, with their several metropolitan and suffragan sees, from which a pretty

fair estimate may be formed of the growth of Catholicity in the great American Union in the course of a century:—

I. Province of Baltimore, comprising the States of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and East Florida. Metropolitan see: *Baltimore*, Md. Suffragan sees: *Charleston*, S. C.; *Richmond*, Va.; *Savannah*, Ga.; *St. Augustine*, Fla.; *Wheeling*, W. Va.; *Wilmington*, Del.; and the apostolic vicariate of *North Carolina*.

II. Province of Philadelphia, comprising the State of Pennsylvania. Metropolitan see: *Philadelphia*. Suffragan sees: *Pittsburg* and *Allegheny*, *Harrisburg*, *Scranton*, and *Erie*.

III. Province of New York, comprising the States of New York and New Jersey. Metropolitan see: *New York*. Suffragan sees: *Albany*, *Brooklyn*, *Buffalo*, *Rochester*, *Ogdensburg*, all in the State of New York, and *Newark*, in New Jersey.

IV. Province of Boston, comprising the New England States. Metropolitan see: *Boston*, Mass. Suffragan sees: *Springfield*, Mass.; *Burlington*, Vt.; *Portland*, Me.; *Hartford*, Conn.; and *Providence*, R. I.

V. Province of Cincinnati, comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Southern Michigan, and Kentucky. Metropolitan see: *Cincinnati*, O. Suffragan sees: *Cleveland* and *Columbus*, O.; *Detroit*, Mich.; *Louisville* and *Covington*, Ky.; and *Vincennes* and *Fort Wayne*, Ind.

VI. Province of Milwaukee, comprising the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, Northern Michigan, and Dakota Territory. Metropolitan see: *Milwaukee*, Wis. Suffragan sees: *Green Bay* and *La Crosse*, Wis.; *Marquette* and *Saut Ste. Marie*, Mich.; *St. Paul*, Minn.; and the apostolic vicariate of *Northern Minnesota*.

VII. Province of St. Louis, comprising the States of Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Indian Territory. Metropolitan see: *St. Louis*, Mo. Suffragan sees: *St. Joseph's*, Mo.; *Alton*, *Peoria*, and *Chicago*, Ill.; *Dubuque*, Iowa; *Nashville*, Tenn.; *Leavenworth*, Kan.; and the apostolic vicariate of *Nebraska*, with seat at Omaha.

VIII. Province of New Orleans, comprising the States of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Arkansas. Metropolitan see: *New Orleans*, La. Suffragan sees: *Natchitoches*, La.; *Mobile*, Ala.; *Natchez*, Miss.; *Little Rock*, Ark.; *Galveston* and *San Antonio*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville*, Texas.

IX. Province of San Francisco, comprising the States of California and Nevada and all the territory lying west of the Rio Colorado. Metropolitan see: *San Francisco*. Suffragan sees: *Grass Valley*, *Montery* (and *Los Angeles*), both in California.

X. Province of Oregon, comprising the State of Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho, Vancouver's Island, and Alaska. Metropolitan see: *Oregon*, O. Suffragan sees: *Nesqually*, W. T.; *Vancouver's Island* (with seat at *Victoria*); and the apostolic vicariate of *Idaho*.

XI. Province of Santa Fé, comprising New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona. Metropolitan see: *Santa Fé*, N. M. Suffragan apostolic vicariates: *Colorado* and *Arizona*.

There are also six *mitred abbots* in the United States, viz.: one at *St. Vincent's* Pa.; one at *St. Meinrad's* Ind.; one at *Clinton*, Minn.; one at *Atchison*, Kan.; one at *Gethsemani*, Ky.; and one at *New Melleray*, Iowa. The first four belong to the Order of *St. Benedict*, and the last two to that of *La Trappe*.

According to the Catholic Almanac of 1878, there are in the United States, belonging to the Catholic Church, 11 ecclesiastical provinces, 59 archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, 7 apostolic vicariates, 1 apostolic prefecture, 6 mitred abbots, 5,548 priests, 5,634 churches, 1,777 chapels and stations, 21 theological seminaries, 1,121 ecclesiastical students, 74 colleges, 519 academies and select schools, 2,130 parish schools, 248 orphanages, and 102 hospitals.

The bishops of the United States, who, by absolute, inalienable right, and not by tolerance or concession or privilege, worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, obedient to the instructions of the Council of Trent, began to hold provincial and national synods as soon as circumstances permitted them to do so. Seven provincial councils were held in Baltimore between the years 1829 and 1849, and two national councils have been held in the same city. Provincial councils were also held in several other metropolitan cities. The First Plenary Council of Baltimore, presided over by the Most Rev. *Francis Patrick Kenrick*, Archbishop of Baltimore and Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See, was held in May, 1852, there being six archbishops and twenty-six bishops in attendance. By a decree of July 25, 1858, the prerogative of precedence was vested in the see of *Baltimore*, thus giving the archbishop of that city the right to preside at all plenary councils or other ecclesiastical assemblages of the archbishops and bishops of the United States.

The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in October, 1866, was presided over by the Most Rev. *Martin John Spalding*, as Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See, and attended by forty-four archbishops and bishops, two mitred abbots, many superiors of Religious Orders, and a large number of theologians.

The contributions to the theological and ecclesiastical literature of the United States made by Archbishop Kenrick[1] and Archbishop Spalding are both numerous and valuable. Both were men of eminent piety and learning. An elegant life of the latter has been written by his nephew, the present Bishop of Peoria.[2] Since the opening of the present century, many great bishops, whose lives have lent a lustre to the Church in America, have passed to their reward. The most eminent of these are Bruté, Flaget, David, Dubois, England, Rosati, the two Fenwicks (one of Cincinnati and the other of Boston), *Hughes*,[3] Kenrick, and Spalding, whose names will be held in grateful and abiding remembrance by succeeding generations.[4]

The Religious Orders in the United States are so numerous, and the scope of their labours so extensive, that it is difficult in a work like this to do more than enumerate them.

In point of time, the *Sulpicians* were the first to make a permanent settlement in the States of North America. Of this Congregation, founded in 1645 by *M. Olier*, for the exclusive purpose of educating and training candidates for the priesthood, four Fathers and three seminarists, sent out by *M. Emery*, under the care of Father *Charles Nagot* († 1806), came to the United States in 1791, and, after some time, opened the *Theological Seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore*, to which was attached a collegiate or preparatory department. The latter was subsequently removed to Ellicot City, Howard county, Md. In March, 1822, Pius VII. granted the Faculty of St. Mary's the right of conferring University degrees. This Congregation gave to the young Church in America many of the brightest ornaments in both orders of her hierarchy, among whom may be mentioned *Flaget, Maréchal, Bruté, Dubois, Dubourg, Nagot. Badin, Richard*, and *Fredet*.

We have already seen that previously to the suppression of the *Society of Jesus*, its members were among the first and greatest missionaries in the country. After its suppression, Charles Carroll and six companions, who arrived from Europe at the opening of the present century, perpetuated its traditions in the *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, under the direction of the Rev. *Robert Molyneux*, which they entered, May 10, 1805. Other members of the suppressed Society, as they arrived from Europe, were sent to the old Jesuit missions of Maryland and Pennsylvania, or as professors to the *College of Georgetown*, D. C. The colleges under the charge of the restored Society (1814) have been already enumerated (at p. 149); but their greatest educational establishment for higher studies in the United States, and one of the foremost Catholic philosophical and theological schools of the world is that at *Woodstock*, Md., where the young men of the Society are trained in these branches. Their principal novitiate is at Frederick, in the same State. There are two Provinces belonging to the Society in the United States, namely, those of *Maryland* and *Missouri*, besides the five missions of *New York, New Orleans, California, New Mexico*, and *Buffalo*. The Society within the United States contains about 750 members. The "missions" given by the Jesuit Fathers have been attended

---

[1] The works of Most Rev. *F. P. Kenrick* are: The Catholic Doctrine of Justification Philadelphia, 1 vol.; The Primacy of the Apostolic See, ibid., 1838 (tr. into Germ. by Steinbacher, N. Y., 1853); Theologia Dogmatica, 3 vols., Phila., 1839, 1840; Theologia Moralis, ibid., 1841 (rev. ed., Mechlin, 1861); Treatise on Baptism and Confirmation, Phila., 1843, Balt., 1852; Vindication of the Cath. Church, Balt., 1855; Translation, (and Annotation) of all the Books of the O. and N. T., publ. at N. Y. and Balt. betw. 1849-1860. (Tr.)

[2] Most Rev. *M. J. Spalding's* works: Evidences of Catholicity, Louisville, 1847 (4th ed., Baltimore, 1866); Life of Bishop Flaget, Louisville, 1852: Miscellanea, ibid., 1855; Reviews, Lectures, and Essays, ibid., 1855; Sketches of Ky., ibid.; A Hist. of the Prot. Ref. in Germany and Switzerland, 2 vols., Louisville, 1860 (4th ed., Balt., 1866); Hist. of Engl. Lit., N. Y., 1862; Spir. Retr., Louisville, 1864. The Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore, by *J. L. Spalding*, S. T. L., New York, 1873. (Tr.)

[3] His Life, by *J. R. G. Hassard*, New York, 1866; His Works, ed. by *L. Kehoe*, New York, 1865; Hughes and Breckinridge's Controversy, Philadelphia, 1835. (Tr.)

[4] See *R. H. Clarke's* Lives of Deceased Bishops of the U. S., N. Y., 1872, 2 vols. (Tr.)

with unparalleled success, and the names of *De Smet*, *McElroy*, *Smarius*, *Damen*, and *Weninger* are familiar to every Catholic American.

The first house of the *Dominicans* in the United States was founded at *St. Rose's*, Ky., by the Rev. Edward D. Fenwick, subsequently Bishop of Cincinnati, who, accompanied by three Fathers from the English mission, arrived from Europe in 1805. The convent of St. Joseph's, Perry county, Ohio, was founded in 1818, and Rev. *Nicholas Young*, who assisted Father Fenwick in building the first chapel in the same State, is still alive, being now past eighty, but still hale and hearty. Bishop Fenwick, after his appointment to the see of Cincinnati, introduced into his diocese the Sisters of St. Dominic and the Sisters of Charity from Emmittsburg. In 1852, when the latter affiliated with the Mother House in Paris, the colony in the diocese of Cincinnati, then as now presided over by the venerable Archbishop Purcell, clung to the traditions and dress of Mother Seton, and formed a separate community, which is now in a very flourishing condition, numbering two hundred and fifty members, scattered through many dioceses, and having charge of parochial schools, orphanages, hospitals, and a foundling house. The Dominican Fathers are mainly occupied in giving missions and teaching in colleges. The Order has eight establishments in the United States, two of which are in Kentucky, two in Ohio, one in Tennessee, one in New York, one in Washington, D.C., and one in New Jersey, besides other houses in California. Not including the members in the last-named State, there are about fifty Dominican priests in the United States. The present Archbishop of San Francisco, Most Rev. *Sadoc Alemany*, and the present Bichop of St. Paul, Right Rev. *Thomas L. Grace*, were formerly members of the Order.

The *Benedictines*, of whom there are at present about 300 in the United States, were introduced, in 1846, by the Right Rev. Abbot General *Bonifacius Wimmer*, of Metten, Bavaria. Besides nine Priories, they have Abbacies at *St. Vincent's*, Penn.; *St. Louis on the Lake*, Minn.; and *Atchison*, Kan. The Swiss Benedictines, from *Maria Einsedeln*, founded an abbey at St. Meinrad's, Ind., which is now in a very flourishing condition. There is also a college attached to each of these abbeys, all of which are prospering.

There are many branches of the numerous family of the *Franciscans* in the United States. The *Recollects*, who came to Cincinnati, O., more than thirty years ago, have a *Gymnasium* in that city, and attached to the same *Custody*, under the patronage of *St. John the Baptist*, the Houses of Study at *Oldenburg*, Ind., and *Louisville*, Ky. The Recollects have also Colleges at *Teutopolis* and *Quincy*, Ill.; and *Santa Barbara*, Cal. A colony of Franciscans from Rome settled at Alleghany, New York, in 1854, where they have a college. The *Capuchins* have a house in New York and another in Wisconsin, to which Calvary College is attached. The *Conventuals* have many important establishments in the United States, and conduct two colleges, one at *Loreto*, Pa., founded in 1847, and another at *Brooklyn*, N. Y.

The first *Trappists* came to the United States in 1805, but subsequently settled in Nova Scotia, where they founded the abbey of *New Clairvaux*. The next colony, in charge of Father *Eutropius*, arrived in 1848, and settled at *Gethsemane*, Nelson County, Ky., where they have now a large and beautiful abbey, under the patronage of *Our Lady of La Trappe*. A third colony from Ireland went to Iowa, and founded the flourishing abbey of *New Melleray*.

A colony of *Augustinians*, from Dublin, Ireland, came to the United States in 1790, and settled in Philadelphia, where they largely contributed to the spread and progress of Catholicity. They were burned out by a mob in 1844, but the church and rectory of St. Augustine were subsequently rebuilt. They are tolerably numerous, and have at the present time thirteen establishments in the country, the chief of which is the Monastery of Villanova, near Philadelphia, to which a college, with the privileges of a university, is attached.

In 1815 the *Priests of the Congregation of the Mission* were brought from Rome to New Orleans by Bishop Dubourg, and three years later founded the Seminary of *St. Mary's of the Barrens*, Perry County, Mo., which was for many years the nursery of the missionaries of the Mississippi Valley. The priests of this Congregation now number about eighty, are chiefly engaged in giving missions, and possess thirteen religious houses. They have churches in St. Louis, New Orleans, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and other large cities, and conduct, besides St. Mary's of the Barrens, St. Vincent's Seminary and College, *Cape Girardeau*, Mo.; the Seminary of Our Lady of Angels, *Niagara Falls*, N. Y.; St. John B.'s Seminary and College, *Brooklyn*, N. Y.; St. Vincent's College, *Los Angeles*, Cal.; and *Germantown* Day College, Pa.

In 1832 three Fathers of the *Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer* arrived at Baltimore from Austria, and took charge of the rapidly growing *German* Catholic population of that city, and gradually extended their labours to Catholics of other nationalities.

The Congregation now counts about one hundred and sixty members, who have the care of churches in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, New York, New Orleans, Chicago, St. Louis, and in others of the more considerable cities. On November 5, 1875, the Redemptorists of the United States were divided into the two *Provinces of Baltimore and St. Louis*. Their House of Studies is at *Ilchester*, Md. The late learned Bishop *Neumann*, of Philadelphia, belonged to this Congregation, as does also Bishop *Gross*, at present of Savannah.

The *Congregation of the Holy Cross*, founded in France immediately after the Revolution, and approved by the Holy See as a teaching body, was introduced into the United States, in 1841, by Father *Sorin*, the present General. Besides the Mother House, *Notre Dame*, near *South Bend*, Ind., it has nineteen houses scattered through Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Texas. Their more considerable educational establishments are the University of Notre Dame, near South Bend, Ind., where the *Ave Maria*, a magazine, devoted exclusively to promoting the honour of the Blessed Virgin, is published; St. Mary's College, *Galveston*, Texas; and the College of the Sacred Heart, *Watertown*, Wisconsin. There are at present more than two hundred members in the Congregation, including priests and brothers.

The *Congregation of the Most Precious Blood*, founded by the venerable *Gaspar Bufalo* († 1837), was introduced into the United States by Father *De Sales Brunner* in 1844, and now possesses many religious houses and two seminaries, one at *Carthagena* O., and another at *Rohnerville*, Cal.

The first band of the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, founded in France, in 1684, by the venerable *John B. de la Salle*, and approved by Benedict XIII. in 1725, came to the United States in 1846, and began work first at Baltimore, and shortly after at New York. These efficient educators conduct *colleges* at *New York*, *Baltimore*, *St. Louis*, *San Francisco* (two), *Philadelphia*, *Buffalo*, *Memphis*, *Prairie du Chien*, and *Santa Fé*, besides numerous schools and academies in the more important cities, which are attended by about 26,000 pupils. Their number is above 700, and they possess altogether 49 establishments of various kinds, of which seven are orphanages, the best known of these latter being the *Catholic Protectory at Westchester*, N. Y.

The *Brothers of Mary*, also devoted to education, founded in France, in 1817, by Rev. *Wm. Jos. Cheminade*, and approved by Gregory XVI. in 1839, were introduced into the United States in 1849, and possess at present 23 houses in the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Illinois, Louisiana, and Texas.

The *Congregation of Missionary Priests*, known as the *Oblates of Mary Immaculate*, founded, in 1816, by Mgr. *Charles de Mazenod*, subsequently Bishop of Marseilles, and approved by Leo XII. in 1826, after labouring zealously among the Indian tribes of Athabasca-Mackenzie for many years, crossed over to the United States in 1848, where they have now seven houses, and conduct St. Mary's College, *Galveston*, Texas; St. Joseph's, *Brownsville*, Texas; and St. Michael's, *Jefferson*, La. They have also charge of an Indian school and five Indian missions in Washington Territory.

The *Passionists*, founded in 1735 by St. Paul of the Cross, whose aim was to combine the activity of the Jesuit with the austerity of the Trappist, were first introduced into the United States from Rome by Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, in 1853. They are chiefly engaged in giving missions, and their missions throughout the country have been uniformly eminently successful. They have at present prosperous houses at Birmingham, Pa.; Hoboken and Dunkirk, N. Y.; Baltimore, Md., and Cincinnati, O.

The *Xaverian Brothers*, founded at Bruges, Belgium, by Brother Francis Xavier (*Thos. Jas. Ryken*) in 1839, and introduced into the United States by Bishop Spalding of Louisville, in 1854, have under their charge, besides eight parochial schools, *Mt. St. Joseph's College*, Carrollton, Md., incorporated in 1876.

The *Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle*, founded by the Very Rev. *I. T. Hecker*, in 1858, was intended to meet and supply the religious wants peculiar to Americans, and is characteristically a missionary Congregation. It possesses as yet only one house in the United States, that of New York city. The *Catholic World* and the *Catholic Publication Society* are both the products of this Congregation, which, it is to be hoped, will have a long career of usefulness.

The *Priests of the Congregation of the Resurrection* conduct St. Mary's College, Marion County, Ky.

The *Missionaries of the Sacred Heart* have a House of Studies and a Novitiate at *Watertown*, in the diocese of Ogdensburg, N. Y.

It is impossible, in a work like this, to give a detailed history of the numerous Religious Orders and Congregations of Women in the United States. Their spirit of self-sacrifice is beyond all praise, and the blessings their labours have brought upon the Catholics of that country beyond computation. No better testimony to their merits could

be given than that contained in the words applied to them by the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (nro. 415.)'

The number of CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES IN THE UNITED STATES for the education and training of young men, whether seculars or ecclesiastics, has increased with the growth of the Church, and is at present about seventy-five. Those under the care of Religious Orders have already been noticed, and it only remains to say a few words of those conducted by secular priests.

Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md., was founded in 1809 by the Rev. Father *Dubois*, later on Bishop of New York, and was subsequently directed by *Father Bruté*, who has been called its "*Good Angel*," and by the Rev. Dr. *Purcell*, the present Archbishop of Cincinnati, during whose incumbency it obtained (1830) the power of conferring degrees. Among the illustrious men whom it has given to the Church in America the names of Archbishop Hughes, Archbishop Purcell, and Cardinal McCloskey stand pre-eminent.

The Seminary of *St. Charles Borromeo*, at Overbrook, Pa., was founded by Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia, in 1838, and at once empowered to confer degrees. The discipline of this institution is strictly in accord with the prescriptions of the Council of Trent. Dr. *Corcoran*, the distinguished theologian, Oriental scholar, and editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, which has taken the place of the famous *Brownson's Quarterly*,

---

[1] The following statistical table from the Church History of the United States, by Mr. *J. O'Kane Murray*, is tolerably full and accurate, and will give a pretty correct idea of the Religious Orders and Congregations of women in that country :—

Name of Order.	Founded.	Introduced into the U. S.	Number of houses.	Academies.	Schools.	Asylums.	Hospitals.	Total No. of Members.
Ursulines	1535	1727	12	12	.....	.....	.....	360
Carmelites	1542	1790	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	31
Visitation Nuns	1610	1808	18	18	.....	.....	.....	Circa. 350
Sisters of Charity (Emmittsburg, Md.)	1809	1809	102	1	50	38	30	1,151
Sisters of Charity (Mt. St. Vincent's, N. Y.),	1809	1809	81	16	48	13	2	600
*Sisters of Charity (St. Joseph's, Delhi, Hamilton County, O.)	1809	1809	31	5	25	3	2	250
Ladies of the Sacred Heart	1800	1818	20	20	15	2	.....	819
Sisters of Charity (of Nazareth)	1812	1812	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	290
Sisters of Loreto	1812	1812	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	326
Dominican Nuns	1296	1823	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy	1829	1829	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100
Sisters of St. Joseph	1650	1836	60	42	.....	20	9	1,500
Sisters of the Holy Cross	1834	1843	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	250
Sisters of Mercy	1830	1843	55	50	30	30	20	Circa. 1,350
Sisters of the Good Shepherd	1651	1843	17	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
Sisters of Notre Dame	1804	1840	22	.....	.....	.....	.....	Circa. 350
Sisters of Providence	1812	1839	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
School Sisters of Notre Dame	1597	1847	108	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000
Presentation Nuns	1777	1854	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
Gray Nuns	1747	1854	3	.....	.....	3	2	28
Sisters of Charity (of the House of Providence)	1843	1854	10	2	8	4	2	64
Servite Sisters	1233	1870	1	.....	1	.....	.....	7
Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ	1849	1868	7	.....	5	1	1	62
Little Sisters of the Poor	1840	1868	18	.....	.....	.....	.....	200

* Added by Translator.

In addition to the above, the following should also be enumerated: Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis; Sisters of St. Claire; Benedictine Nuns; Ladies of the Incarnate Word; Sisters of Our Lady of Charity: Daughters of the Cross; Oblate Sisters of Providence (coloured); Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin; Sisters of Notre Dame, of Namur; Sisters of the Holy Names; Sisters of St. Ann; Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis; Sisters of the Precious Blood; Sisters of Christian Charity; Sisters of the Agonizing Heart of Jesus; Sisters of the Holy Childhood; Sister Servants of the Immaculate Heart; Sisters of the Humility of Mary; Sisters of the Immaculate Conception; Sisters of the Holy Family; and the Polish Sisters of St. Felix; in all *forty-five* Religious Orders of women in the Union.

suspended at the close of 1875, is a member of its Faculty. The building itself, erected under the auspices of Archbishop *Wood*, is one of the finest structures in the world devoted to the purposes of Catholic education, and cost above a half a million of dollars.

Mt. St. Mary's of the West, at Cincinnati, Ohio, founded by Archbishop *Purcell* in 1848, and opened for the reception of students on October 2, 1851, received a charter empowering it to confer collegiate degrees in 1856. By the Provincial Council of 1858 it was made the provincial seminary for theological, and *St. Thomas'*, near Bardstown, Ky., founded by Bishop *David* in 1814, and subsequently transferred to St. Joseph's, Bardstown, for preparatory or collegiate studies. Since 1863 Mt. St. Mary's has been a strictly ecclesiastical institution. Its collegiate course embraces seven and its theological three years. It contains a valuable library, numbering about 16,000 volumes.

The Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, Milwaukee, Wis., was founded by the Rev. Dr. *Salzmann*, in July, 1855, under the auspices of the Most Rev. *M. Henni*, first Bishop and Archbishop of Milwaukee. It is provided at present with a corps of thirteen professors, and attended by 265 students, 133 of whom are studying theology and philosophy.

St. Joseph's Provincial Theological Seminary, Troy, New York, was founded, in 1864, by Archbishop Hughes. Its first corps of professors came from Belgium, but some chairs have been since filled by Americans.

The *Seminary of the Immaculate Conception*, South Orange, N. J., connected with *Seton Hall* College, was founded in 1856 by the Right Rev. *J. Roosevelt Bayley*, then Bishop of Newark, but subsequently appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore, where he died in 1877. This institution was empowered to confer degrees in 1861.

There are also theological seminaries conducted by secular priests at *New Orleans*, *Louisville*, and *Cleveland*; and preparatory seminaries at *Rochester*, N. Y.; *Norfolk*, Va.; *Savannah*, Ga.; and *Bardstown*, Ky.; and a number of students studying for the dioceses of the United States at the North American College, *Rome*; at the American College, *Louvain*; at St. Sulpice, *Paris*; and at the Grand Seminary of *Montreal*.

Great as are the advantages enjoyed by the Catholics of the United States in the matter of higher education, they are by no means equal to those enjoyed by their co-religionists and neighbours of *Canada*. The latter have also a well-organized system of Public Schools, which here, as in *Australia* and *Capeland*, receive a due proportion of the public funds set apart for educational purposes.

The *Laval University*, founded in 1852, is an outgrowth of the *Seminary of Quebec* founded, in 1663, by Mgr. *Laval*, first Bishop of Canada. It was empowered by royal charter to confer degrees in arts, science, law, and medicine, and by the Holy See in theology, and has 26 professors.

At Quebec there is a *Greater Seminary*, attended by 42 students, and a *Lesser*, attended by 225 interns and 293 externs. In the same diocese are the seminaries of *Notre Dame de Lévis*, *St. Ann*, and that of *Chicoutimi*, completed in 1873.

In the diocese of Montreal the institutions of learning are still more numerous. The *Sulpicians* have here their *Grand Seminary*, with 200 seminarists reading theology; their *Seminary for Philosophy*, and their *College* for preparatory studies, besides the Seminary of St. Sulpice, the Seminary of *St. Teresa*, and the College of the *Assumption*; all under their care. *St. Mary's College of Montreal* is under the direction of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. The *Clercs de St. Viateur*, numbering over one hundred, have their Novitiate and a College at *Joliette*; another College at *Bourget*, in the diocese of Montreal, and have charge of twenty-one establishments besides, eighteen of which are in the province of Quebec and three in the United States.

The *Congregation of the Holy Cross* has its provincial house for Canada, *Notre Dame Côte des Neiges*, near Montreal, and in the same diocese the Colleges of *St. Laurent*, *Notre Dame*, and *St. Jérome*.

The diocesan seminary of the diocese of *Ottawa* and *Ottawa College* are both conducted by the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate.

The dioceses of *St. Germain de Rimouski*, *St. Hyacinth*, *Sherbrooke*, and *Three Rivers* have each a seminary at the episcopal seat, and the last-named has a second one at *Nicolet*.

In the *Province of Toronto*, Ontario, are the following educational establishments: *St. Michael's College*, embracing preparatory and theological departments, and *De La Salle Institute*, the former conducted by the Basilian Fathers, and the latter by the Christian Brothers, and both situated in the city of Toronto; *St. Jerome's College*, Berlin, in the diocese of *Hamilton*; a *School for Boys*, in charge of the Christian Brothers at *Kingston*; and *Assumption College*, at *Sandwich*, in the diocese of London, under the care of the Basilian Fathers.

In the *Province of Halifax* the following: *St. Mary's College*, Halifax; *St. Francis Xavier's College*, Antigonish; *St. Dunstan's College*, Charlottetown; *St. Michael's College*, Chatham; *St. Joseph's College*, Memramcook, 90 miles N.E. of St. John, N.B.; *St. Bonaventure's College*, St. John's, Newfoundland (exempt diocese); and the *College of St. Pierre*, on the *French* island of the same name, under the direction of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost.

In the *Province of St. Boniface* the following: The *Seminary and College of St. Boniface*, embracing classical and theological departments; *St. Albert's College; St. Louis' School*, at New Westminister, British Columbia; and in the Province of Oregon, *St Louis' College*, Vancover's Island.

CATHOLIC JOURNALISM IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

The first *Catholic journal* published in the United States was *The U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, founded, in 1822, by Bishop *England*, of Charleston, S. C., who was its chief editor for twenty years. It was an able exponent of Catholic opinion while it existed, but, owing to the political complications at the South and the breaking out of the war, was unfortunately suspended in 1861. The *Truth Teller* was issued in New York also in 1822, and, in 1833, *The Catholic Diary*, both of which have long since ceased to appear. The first number of *The Jesuit* was issued at Boston in 1829; of *The United States Catholic Free Press* at Hartford in 1830; and of *The Catholic Telegraph* at Cincinnati in 1831. The first two have been many years suspended, and the last is therefore the oldest Catholic paper in the United States. It was founded by the saintly Bishop Fenwick, O.S.D., and has been at all times an uncompromising though temperate advocate of Catholic truth. The Very Rev. *Edward Purcell*, a forcible and elegant writer, of whom Dr. Brownson once said that if his fugitive verses were collected they would form a volume of the finest poetry in the language, was for many years its editor-in-chief.

The *Boston Pilot*, the second oldest, and at one time the most widely circulated Catholic paper in the United States, was founded in 1837. Its tone has been consistently and uniformly one of loyalty to the Church and of fidelity to the interests of Catholic Irishmen, who owe to it a deep debt of gratitude. In the year 1837, the same in which the controversy between Bishop Purcell and Alexander Campbell took place, the first German Catholic weekly published in the United States was issued at Cincinnati. This was the *Wahrheitsfreund*, founded by the Rev. *M. Henni*, now Archbishop of Milwaukee. This paper is at present under the control of the Benziger Bros., has a large circulation, and is warmly devoted to the cause of Catholicity and to the interests of the Germans of the North-west. The *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* of New York, founded nine years later, and ably edited by *Maximilian Oertel*, was at one time very widely circulated.

The New York Freeman's Journal, published at New York, was founded in 1840, and has been edited since 1847 by Mr. *James A. McMaster*, a vigorous and at times intemperate writer, but an uncompromising champion of the rights of the Church and the prerogatives of the Holy See.

The Pittsburgh Catholic was founded, in 1844, by the learned Bishop O'Connor, and has ever since reflected the piety and ardent attachment to Catholic principles that characterized its first editor. In the same year the first number of the *Propagateur Catholique* of New Orleans appeared, and is now published in both English and French.

The Catholic Mirror, the official organ of the province of Baltimore, was the first issued in that city in 1849.

In 1857 the *American Celt*, after it had existed for five years, was superseded by the *New York Tablet*, which is still prospering, and is an able and temperate defender of Catholic truth, though apparently too much of an advertising medium for its publishers.

The *Katholische Volkszeitung* of Baltimore, which has the largest subscription list of any German Catholic paper in America, and the *Katholische Wochenblatt* of Chicago, which is unusually enterprising in placing early news before its readers, were both founded in 1860.

The *Ave Maria* (magazine), founded, in 1865, by Very Rev. *E. Sorin*, C.S.C., at Notre Dame, Ind., was for a time edited by the late Father Gillespie, and in 1866 received an approbation from the Holy See.

The *Katholischer Glaubensbote* of Louisville, and *The Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia were both founded in 1866, the first editor of the latter being the Rev. *James Keogh*, D.D. This paper, at present edited by Mr. *G. D. Wolf*, has been specially enterprising of late, and is now in the front rank of Catholic journals in the United States.

The New Orleans *Morning Star*, one of the most widely circulated of Southern

journals appeared in 1868, and *The Louisville Advocate* was revived for the third time in 1869, but is again suspended.

The Irish World, founded at Brooklyn, New York, in 1870, by Mr. *P. Ford*, is an independent and intemperate advocate of everything Irish, and, by its reckless and heated denunciations, has done infinitely more harm than good to the Catholic cause.

The Catholic Review of New York and Brooklyn, founded, in 1872, by its present editor, Mr. *P. V. Hickey*, is thoroughly Catholic in principle, dignified in tone, and in literary merit of exceptional excellence.

Among the Catholic weeklies that have most recently appeared are *The Catholic Temperance Abstinence Union* of New York; *The Hartford Catholic; The Lake Shore Visitor* of Erie (1873); *The Ohio Waisenfreund* (1873); *The Catholic Universe* of Cleveland, founded by Bishop *Gilmour* in 1874; *The Chicago Pilot; The Catholic Columbian* of Columbus, O., founded, in 1875, by the Right Rev. *S. H. Rosecrans*, its chief editor, whose brilliant and condensed paragraphs frequently suggest more matter for thought than the editorials of most writers; *The Illustrated Weekly* of New York, founded by Colonel *McGee* in 1876, and, as a rule, a most creditable production.

All the papers enumerated above are *weeklies*.

There are only two Catholic newspapers issued *daily* in the whole of the North American Continent, namely, the *Nouveau Monde* of Montreal, Canada; and the *America* of St. Louis, Mo., U. S.; the former published in French and the latter in German.

The first Catholic newspaper published in English in Canada was *The Montreal True Witness*, founded by Mr. *Clerk* in 1850. This was followed by *The Morning Freeman* of St. John's, N.B., an excellent paper; by *The Irish Canadian* of Toronto, founded by Mr. *P. Boyle*, its present editor, in 1863; and by *The Tribune* of Toronto, founded in 1874, both of which are sterling Catholic journals.

The U. S. Catholic Magazine, started in 1842, and suspended in 1849, was the first *monthly* periodical of marked ability that appeared in the United States, and was, during the term of its existence, under the editorial management of Rev. Dr. *Charles White* († 1878) and Rev. Dr. *M. J. Spalding*.

The Metropolitan of Baltimore, the first number of which was issued in 1853 and the last in 1858, though not so solid as the magazine, was more acceptable to a larger class of readers.

The Catholic World of New York, founded, in 1865, by the Very Rev. *I. T. Hecker*, C.S.P., is the ablest, as well as the most successful monthly that has yet appeared in the United States, and will compare favourably with those of any other country.

The Catholic Record of Philadelphia, founded in 1871, though modest in appearance, is ably edited, and contains some instructive and charming articles. Its tone, too, like that of the *Catholic World*, is heartily Catholic.

Among the German Catholic monthly periodicals are the *Pastoral-Blatt*, published at St. Louis, and founded in 1866; the *Alte und Neu Welt* (illustrated), founded in 1866, and published by the Benziger Bros.; the *Katholische Missionen* (illustrated), founded in 1873, and published at St. Louis by B. Herder; and the *Deutscher Hausschatz in Wort und Bild*, founded in 1874, and published by F. Pustet.

Brownson's Review, the first series of which extended from 1844 to 1864, and the second from 1873 to 1875, was certainly the ablest Catholic quarterly that has yet appeared in the United States; and although exception was taken to some of the utterances of its editor, he was never accused of conscious disloyalty, either to the spirit or the letter of Catholic teaching, and in the last pages of the last issue of his great Review, submitted all he had ever written, with the humility and docility of a faithful son of the Church, to the judgment of the Holy See († April 17, 1876).

The American Catholic Quarterly of Philadelphia was founded in 1876, with Dr. *Corcoran* as its chief editor. Among its contributors are some of the ablest ecclesiastics of the Church in America, and many distinguished foreigners. It would be venturing too much, however, to say that it has as yet realized the high hopes its appearance inspired, or that all its contributors are quite up to the standard required in a first-class English Catholic Quarterly.

From the above brief outline it will be seen that there are quite as many newspapers and periodicals in the United States, considering the Catholic population, as in any other country of the world; but it must be added that among all the weekly journals there is not one that can fairly be called a model Catholic paper, or that, as a reliable vehicle of Catholic news or an able and dignified exponent of Catholic opinion, at all approaches the English weeklies.

MEXICO.

The *United States of Mexico*, once the Empire of the Aztecs (*Mexitli*), after a long struggle, frequently interrupted, and as often renewed, between the years 1810 and 1824, finally became independent of Spain, and, as originally constituted, consisted of nineteen States and five Territories. The population of Mexico is mainly made up of Spaniards, Creoles, Mestizos, and Indians. The Catholic Church, which is the only one recognized by the Government, enjoyed comparative prosperity until the latter half of the eighteenth century, when it became evident that a storm was approaching. As usual, the first visitations of its fury fell upon the *Jesuits*, who, though they had either conferred or brought greater blessings upon the country than any other body of men, were *banished* in 1767, and their property confiscated. As *Wolfgang Menzel* very justly remarks, the sweet peace and childlike contentment of the inhabitants were disturbed by the introduction into the country from Europe of a *false philosophy* and the revolutionary principles of European Freemasonry. Fascinated by the siren voice of liberty, they pursued it as a phantom, and finally woke to the stern conviction that the hopes it inspired were delusive and its promises a snare.

Few men have deserved better of the country than *Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana*, Patriarch of the Indies, and formerly Archbishop of Toledo († April, 1804), who presided over the Fourth Provincial Council of Mexico, in either 1766 or 1771.[1] From the day the Mexicans became politically an independent people they have been a prey to unceasing intestine dissensions, and have at length lapsed into a state of almost hopeless anarchy. Since then the government of the country, whose chief executive bears the title of President, has passed alternately into the hands of one of the two dominant political parties of Freemasons, the *Ecosesos*, or Centralists, and the *Yorkinos*, or Federalists.

By the Constitution of 1824, which, with the exception of the article relating to religious freedom, was little more than a transcript of that of the United States, the Catholic Church was declared to be the only one tolerated by the Confederacy. In the course of the years 1824 and 1825 a friendly correspondence was carried on with regard to ecclesiastical affairs between Pope Leo XII. and President Victoria. During the ascendancy of the democratic Government of the Yorkinos, bishoprics falling vacant were not filled, and in 1829 there was but a single bishop in all Mexico. This condition of things led to the conclusion of a Convention with the Holy See, which was proclaimed on the 16th of May, 1831, as a fundamental law of the State. Naturally enough, it was opposed by the Spanish Court, which still claimed the right of presenting to bishoprics, and for similar reasons by the Liberals, but was sustained by the Mexican Government. Under the presidency of Santa Anna (from 1833), Congress passed laws suppressing convents and abolishing the compulsory payment of tithes; and it was proposed to confiscate the property of the Church, and appropriate it to the payment of the national debt. These measures roused the indignation of the people, who were at heart still warmly attached to the Church and the Holy See, and uprisings took place, which resulted, in 1835, in the abrogation of the Constitution of 1824, and the concentration of all political power in the hands of Santa Anna. This usurpation was resented by *Texas*, which declared itself independent of Mexico in 1836, and nine years later was annexed to the United States; and by Upper California and New Mexico, both of which seceded from the Mexican Republic in February, 1848. *Herrera*, who succeeded Santa Anna as President in 1848, endeavoured to adjust the differences between Church and State, and to have a Nuncio appointed for Mexico, but without success. The latter measure, which had been in contemplation during the lifetime of Gregory XVI., was brought to a successful issue in 1851, under the presidency of *Arista*, but had little or no influence on the relations of political parties in the country. Mgr. Clementi, the Apostolic Delegate, failed to inspire confidence or to attract to himself the unwavering sympathy of any party;[2] and the negotiations preparatory to the conclusion of a Concordat with the Holy See came to an abrupt termination in 1853, when Arista was driven from power, to be succeeded in the following year by Santa Anna, under whom the condition of the Church became still worse.

In an allocution of December 15, 1856, Pope Pius IX. complained that by the enactments of that and preceding years ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been declared void, the Church

---

[1] *Wittmann*, L. c., pp. 191-212; *Gams*, Vol. II., pp. 49-56, and Vol. III., p. 674 sq

[2] *W. Menzel*, Hist. of Our Own Days, Stuttgart, 1860, p. 318.

despoiled of her estates and possessions, the Bishops of Puebla and Guadalaxara exiled, religious encouraged to quit their monasteries, and other steps taken by the Government highly detrimental to the interests of religion. Santa Anna was succeeded in the presidency by *Alvarez* in 1855, but, after a short absence from power, again became chief magistrate for the third time, only to give way to General *Comonfort* in 1856, under whom the Church was more bitterly persecuted than even under Santa Anna himself. The result of this hostility to the Church was an insurrection, which placed General *Zuloaga* at the head of affairs in 1858. In a letter, dated January, 1858, Zuloaga assured the Holy Father that the Mexicans had always regarded loyalty to the Holy See as their first and highest duty, and deeply regretted the persecution to which the Church had been subjected; that, though the recent enactments against the freedom of the Church and the laws confiscating ecclesiastical property might lead him to believe that the bulk of the inhabitants had abjured the faith of their ancestors and grown hostile to the Holy See, such was not in matter of fact the case; that the abrogation of the offensive statutes had given sincere and universal joy to the nation; and that His Holiness might rest assured that harmony between Church and State was now fully restored.[1] Had Zuloaga remained at the head of affairs, he would have pursued a policy certainly friendly, and possibly highly favourable to the Church; but having been driven from power in 1859, he was unable to carry out his conciliatory measures. In a second allocution, dated September 30, 1861, Pius IX. again protested against the iniquitous laws, directed, not alone against the authority, but also against the teachings of the Church. He complained that ecclesiastical estates had been declared national property and confiscated; that churches had been plundered; that priests, religious, and nuns had been treated with indignity; and that bishops, after having been subjected to all manner of outrage, had been expelled the country.[2]

Most of the exiled bishops took up their residences in Rome, and, on their representation, the Pope made a new division of the dioceses of Mexico, many of which were excessively large. This measure was made public in an allocution of March 16, 1863.[3] The hopes of the friends of the Church revived when, on the 10th of July, 1863, the Assembly of Notables, by a vote of 250 against 20, declared in favour of an hereditary monarchy under a Roman Catholic emperor. The crown was offered to Maximilian of Austria, who landed at Vera Cruz, May 20, 1864, and entered the Mexican capital on the 12th of the following June, under the title of *Maximilian I.*, Emperor of Mexico. Maximilian was reputed to have been the most accomplished prince of Europe, and his misfortunes in Mexico are to be ascribed to the rashness of his friends, the duplicity of his patrons, and the unreasonable and persistent hostility of his enemies, rather than to any lack of ability on his part or to any antagonism of the religious principles by which he was guided, with the legitimate aspirations of a people desirous of being great and free. Directly on his arrival in the city of Mexico, the clerical party demanded the immediate and unconditional restoration of the ecclesiastical property confiscated and sold during the ascendancy of Juarez and the French regency. As this amounted to about *one-third* of the real estate of the empire and *one-half* of the immovable property of the municipalities, and had already passed from the first to the second, and in some instances to the third purchaser, it was plainly impossible for the emperor to satisfy this demand. When Mgr. *Meglia*, the Papal Nuncio, avowed his inability to find any satisfactory solution of the question, Maximilian threw himself into the arms of the liberal party, and on the 27th of December, 1864, instructed his ministers to bring in a bill, which was immediately passed by the chambers, vesting the management and sale of ecclesiastical property in the Council of State.

In the meantime Mgr. Meglia resigned his position, May 27, 1865; and a committee, followed some time later by Father *Fischer*, was sent to Rome to adjust matters, but before anything could be accomplished the empire had ceased to exist. At the demand of the United States Government, which peremptorily refused to recognize Maximilian, the French troops, under Marshal *Bazaine*, were withdrawn early in 1867. The emperor was, in consequence, left to contend at fearful odds against the republican General *Escobedo*, and, after a series of disasters, was finally made prisoner at Queretaro on the 15th of May, 1867, and on the 19th of the succeeding June he, together with his two generals, *Miramon* and *Mejia*, was shot.

---

[1] *Freiburg Kirchenblatt*, 1858, p. 157 sq.
[2] *Moy*, Archives of Canon Law, 1862, Vol. VII. (I.), p. 117.
[3] Cf. *Moy*, Archives, 1863, Vol. IX. (III.), p. 433 sq.

Juarez re-entered the city of Mexico, July 16, and was elected president in the following October. He was the first of the Mexican presidents to serve the full term of his office. He died in 1872. The triumphs of the republic, however, did not put an end either to civil war or religious persecution, and, in 1875, severe laws were again enacted against the Church.

According to the Gotha Almanac, the population of Mexico, in 1868, was 8,259,000, which, with the exception of about 100,000 infidel Indians and a few strangers, is entirely Catholic. In 1848, there was one metropolitan and eleven suffragan sees and 1,235 parishes in the whole country, which is about six times the size of Italy. The number was manifestly insufficient, and, as has been mentioned, Pius IX., in 1863, divided the country into three ecclesiastical bishoprics, and established six new bishoprics. The following is the present ecclesiastical organization:—

I. Metropolitan see: *Mexico.* Suffragan sees: Victoria, Puebla, Chiapa, Oaxaca, Yucatan (or Merida), Vera Cruz, Chilapa, and Tulancingo.

II. Metropolitan see: *Michoacan* (with seat at Morelia). Suffragan sees: San Luis de Potosi, Querétaro, Leon, and Zamora.

III. Metropolitan see: *Guadalaxara.* Suffragan sees: Durango, Linares (with seat at Monterey), Sonora, and Zacatecas, and the Vic. Ap. of Lower California.[1]

In former times, each cathedral had its chapter, where, according to an enactment of the Third Provincial Council, held in 1585, there should be a dean, an archdeacon, a chanter, a theologian, a treasurer, ten canons, six prebendaries, and six ecclesiastics, with competent revenues.[2] By permission of the Holy See, granted in 1830, the Chapters propose three candidates for a vacant episcopal see; of these the Government selects one, upon whom the Pope confers canonical investiture.[3] As long as Mexico was a dependency of Spain, the bishops exercised the same jurisdiction, and were subject to the same limitations as those of the mother country, where the canon law of the Church was in force, but under the republic their condition was wholly changed.[4] During the same period the bishops had very handsome revenues, the largest being about $130,000 or pesos, and the smallest about $25,000; at present the revenues range from $5,000 to $10,000. This is the nominal sum set down in the public budget, but in matter of fact both bishops and priests are supported by the voluntary contributions of the faithful. It is estimated that there are at present about 10,000 priests in Mexico, 3,223 of whom are secular clergy. They are educated in the older diocesan seminaries and in monasteries, and, since the expulsion of Spanish ecclesiastics by President Guerrero, are mostly Indians. Although only moderately educated, they are exemplary and zealous in the discharge of their duties.[5]

No class of men have done more for Mexico than the *Religious Orders*, and none have been more shamelessly and ungratefully treated by the Republican Government. The Jesuits were banished by the Spanish Government first in 1767, and their colleges, convents, and great wealth declared confiscated to the Crown; and were again similarly dealt with by the Republic. The Franciscans, Augustinians, and Dominicans, though never formally suppressed, were despoiled of all their property.

In 1810 there were 149 convents in Mexico, containing 1,931 monks, and distributed into thirteen provinces, six of which belonged to the Franciscans, three to the Dominicans, two to the Augustinians, one to the Carmelites, and one to the Mercederians. There were at the same date six missionary colleges, containing 329 students.[6] The capitalized value of the property belonging to the Religious Orders was between nine and ten millions of pesos.[7] In 1845 there were 150 convents of men, 68 of which belonged to the Franciscans, 25 to the Dominicans, 22 to the Augustinians, 19 to the Order of Mercy, and 16 to the Carmelites;[8] and in 1856 there were 146 convents and 1,139 monks. The entire property of these Religious Orders was confiscated by President Comonfort. In 1860 the Recollect Franciscans possessed 30 religious houses, the Dominicans 25, the Augustinians 10, and the Carmelites 10, while the Jesuits were established at Mexico; the Oratorians

---

[1] *Moy*, Archiv., 1863, Vol. IX. (III.), p. 433 sq.; *Gerarch. Catt.*, 1877, pp. 53, 54, 62.

[2] *Moroni*, Vol. II., p. 14. [3] *Gams*, L. c., p. 683.

[4] Conf. *Hergenröther*, The Negotiations of Spain with the Holy See, in Moy's Archiv., Vol. X. (II.) sq.

[5] *Merz*, L. c., Vol. VII., p. 138. [6] *Gams*, L. c., p. 677. [7] The *same*, p. 679.

[8] *Gams*, L. c., p. 689

at Mexico, Puebla, and Guadalaxara; the Benedictines at Mexico; and the Brothers of Charity at Mexico and Oaxaca.

In 1810 there were 57 convents of women in Mexico, containing 1,962 inmates; in 1845, 50 convents and 2,000 religious; and in 1856, according to the testimony of Baron von Richthofen, 39 convents and 3,160 religious. All orders of female religious were suppressed by act of government in 1863; the Sisters of Charity, who had been introduced into the country from Europe about 1845, being the only religious community of women recog-[1]

There is but one university[2] in the country, that of the City of Mexico, founded in 1551, having 22 professors and a library of 50,000 volumes.

There are colleges in every considerable town, 35 of which are under ecclesiastical supervision, besides 37 seminaries and 2 high schools or lyceums, situated at San Luis Potosi and Guanajuato.

Primary schools do not exist except in the larger cities, which, it is said, is due more to republican misgovernment than to the neglect of the clergy, who are not permitted to exercise their energies in this field. Between the years 1822 and 1850, what is known as the Bell-Lancaster System of Mutual Instruction[3] was introduced by the Director-General of Primary Instruction, with a view to educate the people out of what is called by euphemism their "fanaticism."

The Emperor Maximilian designed to introduce a complete and thorough system of public instruction, and to raise the standard of studies to that of the best schools of Europe, but time was not given him to carry out his benevolent and enlightened purposes.[4]

Almost every town has its orphanage, its house of refuge, and its hospital; there are numerous confraternities;[5] and the greater feasts of the Church are celebrated with unusual pomp and splendour.[6]

While the standard of religion and morality is confessedly low among the Mexicans,[7] the religious sentiment of the people, though perverted, is deep and universal; their charity, whether public or private, according to the testimony of the notorious Calderon de la Barca, is without a parallel in the world; and in mental endowments they are not surpassed by any other people. With peace and good government, they would, there is hardly a doubt, take their place among the foremost nations of the earth.

Central America, which, since 1525, had been subject to Spain, after a protracted and obstinate struggle, lasting from 1815 to 1823, became finally independent, and formed a Federal Republic, comprising Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, with a total population of 2,665,000. A civil conflict, however, continued to rage between the monarchists and the republicans until the dissolution of the Confederacy in 1839, during which the Catholic Church suffered severely. In this year *Carrera* became Dictator of Guatemala, the largest of the five Independent Republics; and in July, 1843, the Jesuits, whose labours had brought so many blessings upon that country, and who were still held in grateful remembrance by the people, were recalled by order of the Congress, and the zeal and activity which they still continue to display promise well for the future of the country. Many monasteries were restored and a Concordat concluded with the Holy See in 1852. A Concordat was also concluded with the Republic of *Costa Rica* and a bishopric established at *San José* by Pius IX., March 2, 1850, after this State became independent of the Republic of Nicaragua, to which it had belonged since the dissolution of the Confederacy of Central America. Its population, as officially stated in 1864, was 120,000, of whom 30,000 belonged to San José, where there is a so-called university, with six professors and about 100 students.

The condition of the Church in the republics of *Nicaragua* and *Honduras* is by no means as promising as in Costa Rica. There is an episcopal see at the city of *Nicaragua*; another at *Comayagua*, in Honduras; and a third at *San Salvador*, in the republic of the same name, but its cathedral was nearly destroyed with the city by an earthquake, April 16, 1854.

In the West Indies[8] there are four archiepiscopal and nine episcopal sees and two apostolic vicariates, distributed as follows: San Domingo (no suffragans); Port-au-Prince,

---

[1] *Salzburg Kirchenblatt*, 1863, p. 158.
[2] Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 52, p. 949.
[3] *Gams*, L. c., p. 862.
[4] *Salzburg Kirchenblatt*, 1865, p. 268.
[5] *Salzburg Kirchenblatt*, 1863, p. 315.
[6] *Merz*, L. c., p. 139.
[7] *Kalkar*, L. c., p. 217.
[8] *Jas. Neher*, Eccl. Geog., Vol. III, p. 401 sq.

five; Santiago de Cuba, three; Puerto de España, two; Martinique aud Basseterre, suffragans of the metropolitan see of Bordeaux, each one; and Curaçao and Jamaica, each an apostolic vicariate. The total population of the West Indies in 1862 was 4,071,022, of whom 3,500,000 are Catholics, and about 500,000 Protestants.[1] There are ecclesiastical seminaries at San Domingo, Puerto Rico, Santiago de Cuba, and Curaçao, but these are by no means equal to supply an adequate number of priests, of whom there is a great lack. Among the Religious Orders, whose labours are most productive of good, are the Jesuits, the Redemptorists, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost and of the Sacred Heart of Mary, and the Christian Brothers; and of females, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, and the Sisters of St. Joseph, St. Maurice of Chatres, and the Sacred Heart of Mary. There are universities at Havana and San Domingo, some high schools, and many private institutions of learning.

The West Indies are divided into the following four ecclesiastical provinces: San Domingo, Port-au-Prince, Santiago de Cuba, and Puerto de España. The Province of *San Domingo* comprises the eastern portion of the island, which formerly belonged to Spain; the Lesser Antilles, belonging to Spain; and the Virgin Islands. The population of the Island of San Domingo itself is about 700,000. The Church here was in a tolerably prosperous condition until the date of the declaration of independence (1803), since when, owing to numerous changes of government and incessant wars, ecclesiastical affairs have greatly declined, and between the years 1830 and 1850 there was not a single bishop in the island. In the *Western* or *French portion*, where the aboriginal Indians were exterminated by the cruelty of the early Spaniards and replaced by slaves from Africa, there is now a republic of negroes, with the capital at Port-au-Prince. Their conversion was first undertaken by the Dominicans and subsequently by the Jesuits, who were expelled in 1763. Attempts were made by Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. to improve the condition of the Church in this portion of the island, but with very little success, owing chiefly to the malignant agitation kept up by the Protestants, who received hearty encouragement from their friends in Europe. Bishoprics were established in 1862 at Les Cayes, Cape Hayti, Gonaives, and Port-de-Paix, but most of them have ever since remained without incumbents.

In the *Eastern portion*, forming since 1843 the *Dominican Republic*, with a population of 136,500, the Creoles declared Catholicity the religion of the State; and *John Monetti* was appointed to the archiepiscopal see of San Domingo, but was expelled in 1853 through the agency of English Freemasons.

No improvement took place during the ephemeral rule of the Spaniards, from 1861 to 1865, and when they were driven from the island the Spanish bishops were forced to leave with them. An effort was made, in 1866, by the Redemptorist Father, Louis Buggenons, to again establish relations between the Republic and the Holy See, but since that time the country has been almost continuously disturbed by intestine struggles. The archiepiscopal see of San Domingo is at present administered by a vicar-apostolic.[2]

The prospects of the Church are somewhat more encouraging in the islands belonging to Spain. In *Cuba*, the population of which, in 1872, was 1,370,211, of whom 730,750 were whites, 34,000 Chinese and Hindoo coolies, and 605,461 blacks, there is an archbishopric at *Santiago de Cuba* and suffragan bishoprics at *San Cristóbal de la Habana*, *San Juan de Puerto Rico*, in the island of the same name. *Puerto Rico*, with a population of 700,000, of whom 600,000 are Catholics, was by Pius VII., in 1816, made suffragan to the metropolitan see of San Domingo, but is now again suffragan to Santiago de Cuba;[3] and *Jamaica*, with a population, in 1871, of 506,154, of whom only 13,101 are whites, has an apostolic vicariate. All things considered, the Church is more prosperous in the *Lesser Antilles*, the most important of which is the Island of *Trinidad*, belonging to Great Britain, than in any other portion of the West Indies. In 1850 the apostolic vicariate of Trinidad was changed into the archbishopric of *Port of Spain* (Puerto de España), the capital, to which the bishopric of *Roseau*, on the Island of Dominica, is suffragan. This ecclesiastical province contains about 340,000 inhabitants, of whom 200,000 are Catholics. There was a provincial council held in 1854. Of the Religious Orders, the most numerous and active are the Jesuits, the Eudists, the Redemptorists, who have been lately introduced, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Clugny, and the Ladies of the Sacred Heart.

The bishopric of *Basseterre*,[4] which replaced the apostolic prefecture of *Guadeloupe*,

---

[1] *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 715-722. [2] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, p. 193. (Tr.)

[3] Cfr. *Nehr*, Eccl. Geogr., Vol. III., p. 409, and *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1877, p. 52. (Tr.)

[4] Cf. the Bull of Erection, in the Acta Pii IX. and in La France eccl., 1851, p. 703 sq.

September 27, 1850, had, in 1863, two vicars-general, eighty-five priests, a seminary at the episcopal see, and a Catholic population of 137,000. At the same date the apostolic prefecture of *Martinique* was abolished, and the see of *Fort-de-France*, subsequently transferred to *Saint-Pierre*, established in its stead.[1]

The position of the Church in South America, and notably in that portion of it which revolted from Spain, forming now the *ten republics* of New Granada, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Chili, Argentina, Buenos Ayres, Uruguay, and Paraguay, has in recent times been the reverse of encouraging. The bishoprics of *New Granada* were made suffragan to the metropolitan see of *Santa Fé de Bogotá*, and those of *Venezuela* to that of *Caracas*,[2] by *Leo XII.*, and the see of *New Pamplona* was established, in 1836, by *Gregory XVI.*, and added to the former province. The Jesuits had been recalled, and the hopes of Catholics had barely begun to revive, when a violent persecution against the Church broke out in New Granada. The Jesuits were once more expelled; ecclesiastical estates, whether belonging to the secular or regular clergy, were confiscated; bishops were forcibly ejected from their sees; and, in 1852, President Lopez announced a formal separation between Church and State. In an allocution of September 27, 1852, Pius IX., as chief Pastor of the Church, protested against these hostile enactments, and bestowed special praise upon Archbishop *Mosquera*, who had courageously withstood the assaults of the impious up to the day of his banishment, and died an exile at Marseilles, on his way to Rome, December 10, 1853.

The greatest obstacle to the progress of the Church in New Granada is the new political constitution, studiously elaborated upon the principles of the most radical democracy; to which may be added the blighting influence of an irreligious and immoral press, whose evil effects are only too terribly visible in the atrocious attempts that are daily made upon human life. In the Republic of *Ecuador*, the Jesuits were likewise recalled, but, as in New Granada, only to be again expelled. Although *Quito*, the capital, is the seat of an archiepiscopal see, to which the bishoprics of *Cuenca*, *Guayaquil*, *Ibarra*, *Riobamba*, *Loxa*, and *Puerto Viejo* are suffragan, the condition of religion is by no means promising.[3] *Maria Anna Paredes*, surnamed the Lily of Quito, who died in 1645, was declared blessed by Pius IX.

The metropolitan see for the Republics of *Bolivia* and *Paraguay* is *Charcas*, with residence at Sucre or La Plata or *Chuquisaca*, to which the following sees are suffragan: *La Paz de Ayacucho; Santa Cruz de la Sierra*, at Misque Pocona; *Cochabamba;* and *Paraguay* or Assuncion.[4] The bishoprics of *Buenos Ayres*, *New Cordova*, and *Tucuman*, in which ecclesiastical life was entirely paralyzed during the dictatorship of Rosas (1835-1852), also belonged to the province of Charcas until the year 1865. After the overthrow of Rosas, relations were once more established with the Holy See.[5]

The labours of the missionaries in *Guiana*, or Guayna, in recent times have been successful and encouraging.[6] Under the name of Guiana is included that stretch of coast lying between the mouths of the rivers Marañon or Amazon and Orinoco, which, having been neglected by the Spaniards and Portuguese, was colonized by the English, French, and Dutch. British and Dutch Guiana each contain an apostolic vicariate, and French Guiana an apostolic prefecture. The Catholic population of all Guiana, in 1871, was 90,750, or about one-third of all the inhabitants. Of these 52,250 belong to *Demerara* or British Guiana, 12,500 to *Suinam* or Dutch Guiana, and 26,000 to *Cayenne* or French Guiana. In *French* Guiana, towards the middle of the last century, Father *Lombara* exhibited a most laudable spirit of self-sacrifice, which was zealously emulated by his successors in the same field of labour, among whom Fathers *Besson*, *Carnave*, *Tourrée*, *Autilhac*, and *Huberlant* deserve special mention. During a terrible epidemic which raged in *Dutch* Guiana, Father *Grove* gave an example of the most heroic Christian charity and unbounded reliance in God; and, at the beginning of the second quarter of this century,

---

[1] Cf. the Bull of Erection, in La France eccl., 1851. p. 697.

[2] To the Archbishop of *Bogotá* are suffragan the Bishops of *Cartagena*, *Santa Marta*, *Popayan*, *Panama*, *Pamplona Nueva*, *Antioquia Medellin*, and *Pasto;* to the Archbishop of *Caracas*, the Bishops of *Merida*, *Angostura*, *Cuyo*, *Colaboza*, and *Barquisimeto*.

[3] *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 700 sq. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 706 sq. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 712 sq.

[6] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 136: *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 722.

Father *Hynks*, a Dominican, achieved unexampled success in his missionary labours among the negroes of *British Guiana*.

But of all the countries once forming the territory of the colony belonging to Spain, *Chili* and *Peru*,[1] notably the latter, have given the most assuring evidences of ardent piety and vigorous religious life. Lima, the capital of Peru, was the home of *St. Rose*, and the see of *St. Turibius*, the former the first canonized saint, and the latter the St. Charles Borromeo of the New World. But even in these countries protracted civil wars have had the effect of reducing the number of priests and greatly retarding the growth of religion. In *Chili*, where the *Jesuits* now possess a number of religious houses, they are again actively at work conducting schools and directing souls, with the gratifying results that everywhere attend the labours of these devoted men. There is a normal school at *Santiago*, where teachers are trained for the provincial missions. The suffragan bishoprics of *Lima*, the metropolitan see of Peru, *Arequipa*, *Cuzco*, *Truxillo*, *Maynas*, or Chachapoyas, *Guamanga* or Ayacucho, and *Huánuco* and *Puño*; and of *Santiago*, the metropolitan see of Chili, *Concepcion*, *Serena* or Coquimbo, and *San Carlos de Ancud*.

The Catholic population of Chili, which writers tell us is the most prosperous Republic of the New World, is about two millions, and the Catholic the established Church of the State. The *Araucanian Indians* are for the most part heathen; but since 1841 the Capuchins have had missions established among them with the most encouraging results, and more recently the Jesuits have sent labourers into the same field. The clergy, though not sufficiently numerous, come mainly from upper classes of society, and receive an excellent education, either at the University of Santiago or at one of the missionary colleges at Chiloë, Valdivia, and Concepcion. There is also in Chili an Academy of Sciences; some sixty colleges and academies, at fifty of which instruction is gratuitous; one thousand primary schools, attended by 40,000 children; four hundred intermediate schools; forty-one convents of men and seven of women. The flourishing condition of the schools in this country is due for the most part to the active zeal of the Religious Orders.

The ecclesiastical province of *Buenos Ayres*, as constituted in 1865, comprises, besides the metropolitan see of the same name, the suffragan sees of *Cordova*, *San Juan de Cuyo*, *Parana*, and *Salta*, situated in the Argentine Confederation or the United States of *Rio de la Plata*. The population is about 1,340,000, nearly all of whom are Catholics. There is a university conducted by the Society of Jesus at Buenos Ayres, a greater seminary at Cordova, a lesser seminary at San Juan, a Jesuit college at Santa Fé, and a Franciscan college at Rioquarta. Education is general and compulsory.

The bishopric of *Assuncion* embraces the entire Republic of *Paraguay*, consisting of twenty-five departments, with a population of 1,337,431.

In *Brazil*[2] the work of evangelizing the country, which was going prosperously forward under the *Jesuits*, was interrupted by the persecution of *Pombal*, who had the members of the society expelled the country with circumstances of exceptional brutality and outrage, and amid the tears of the Brazilians, who were sincerely and ardently attached to these noble missionaries. Fortunately, the *Lazarists* were at hand to enter upon the work the Jesuits were forced to leave off, to whom they proved themselves worthy successors. The people of Brazil, who have never wavered in their attachment to the Holy See, gave a signal proof of their loyalty in the year 1834, when the Government declined to recognize the bishop appointed by Rome to the diocese of *Rio de Janeiro*. The whole country, with a population of 11,780,000,[3] all of whom, except about 500,000, are Catholics, constitutes but one ecclesiastical province. *Bahia* or San Salvador is the metropolitan see, to which the bishoprics of *Rio de Janeiro* or San Sebastian, *Belem* or Para, *Cubaba* or Cuyabá, *Olinda* or Pernambuco, *San Luiz de Maranham*, *Mariana*, *Goyaz*, *San Paolo*, and *San Pedro*, in the province of Rio Grande do Sul, *Diamantino* and *Fortalezza* or Ceara, are suffragan. In all these dioceses, with the exception of three, there are ecclesiastical seminaries; still, owing to the petty annoyances and unwarrantable interference of Government, inspired mainly, if not wholly, by the Freemasons, the supply of priests is miserably insufficient. The jurisdiction of the bishops, who are nominated by the emperor, in virtue of his office of Grand Master of the Military Order of Christ, is very much restricted, and as a rule cathedral chapters do not exist. The Religious Orders

---

[1] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 157 sq.; *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 707 sq.

[2] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 143-156; *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 191 sq.

[3] So *La Revista Catolica* of Las Vegas (in New Mexico), in the year 1876, at page 473. The *Encyclopædia Brittannica* (Vol. I., p. 625), from the census taken in 1872, gives but 10,095,978. (Tr.)

are zealous and active, and flourish in spite of the fierce assaults made upon them by the irreligious portions of the press. The Capuchins, Jesuits, and Lazarists are labouring earnestly to convert the natives, who constitute 150 tribes, live in scattered villages, and belong for the most part to the mixed race of the *Tupis*. The Lazarists have quite a large missionary college at Caraca, in the diocese of Mariana. There is a university at San Paolo, possessing, however, neither a theological nor a medical faculty; two medical colleges, styled universities, at Rio and Bahia; two faculties of law at Recife and San Paolo; and 168 high schools and 2,500 primary schools in the entire country. The Church is wholly excluded from the management of *Public Instruction*, the State claiming and exercising complete control. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, about three-fifths of the population are well instructed in the Catholic faith, and are more prosperous and happy than the inhabitants of other countries in South America under English and Protestant influence.[1]

The Eastern Republic of *Uruguay*, called also Montevideo, from the name of its capital, which formerly formed part of the bishopric of Buenos Ayres, was made an apostolic vicariate in 1848. Its population, which is almost entirely Catholic, was 350,000 in 1863, of whom about 150,000 were foreigners. The apostolic vicar and the prefect of the Franciscans for the missions of South America both reside at *Montevideo*.

Of late years the Catholic Church has been making rapid advances in the PHILIPPINE ISLANDS. There has been a bishopric since 1525 and an archbishopric since 1621 at *Manila*, the capital of the Island of Luzon, and there are bishoprics at *Neo-Caceres*, *Zebu* or the Holy Name of Jesus, *New Segovia*, and *Jaro* or St. Elizabeth.

In AUSTRALASIA,[2] however, the progress of the Catholic missions has been seriously impeded by the opposition of the Methodists; by the suspicion roused in the breasts of the natives on account of the protection afforded the missionaries by the *French* in some of the South Sea Islands, and by the frightful immorality and hideous cannibalism prevalent in these countries. As is natural, from the fact that England's power is here supreme, the bulk of the colonists are Anglicans, who have an archbishopric at *Sydney* and bishoprics at *Adelaide*, *Melbourne*, *New Castle*, and *Perth* in *Australia* or New Holland.

An apostolic vicariate, of which Dr. *John Polding*, an English Benedictine, was the first incumbent, was established in 1835, with jurisdiction over Australia, Tasmania (formerly Van Diemen's Land), Norfolk, and other islands, with a population estimated in 1869 at 2,050,000.[3] To these islands are sent all persons transported from the kingdom of Great Britain, who, having been in former times mostly Irish Catholics, and whose greatest crime was their faith, brought abundant blessings upon the land of their exile. They at once asked for priests, who were sent them, and although their missions were opposed by the British Government between the years 1810 and 1820, they contained, in 1840, as many as twenty-three priests, two of whom were in the Island of Tasmania and two in the Island of Norfolk. Reformed convicts and fresh immigrants laid the foundations of new settlements, and the Catholics increased so rapidly through the unwearied labours of Dr. Polding and Father Ullathorne, that, in 1842, it was found necessary to establish an archiepiscopal see at *Sydney*, in New South Wales, and suffragan bishoprics at *Adelaide*, in South Australia, and at *Hobart Town*, in Tasmania. By 1845 there were 56 Catholic missionaries in Australia, 31 Catholic schools, and 28 churches and chapels; and in the same year the first provincial council was held. So unprecedented was the growth of Catholicity that, in 1855, there were in Sydney alone, which then contained 65,000 inhabitants, 20,000 Catholics, fourteen Catholic primary schools, a female academy, conducted by the Benedictine nuns, and a college for boys. The see of *Perth*, in Western Australia, was established in 1845; that of *Melbourne*, in Victoria,[4] in 1847; that of *Victoria*, in North Australia, in 1849; and in 1865 the see of *Maitland* was revived, and those of *Brisbane* and *Bathurst* founded.[5] In 1874, *Melbourne* was raised to metropolitan

---

[1] *Wittmann*, Vol. II., p. 531, quoted by *Kalker*, p. 272.

[2] Cf. Father Charles à S. Aloysio, pp. 104-117.

[3] "Catholic Missions in Australia." (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., in three articles). †**Ed. Michelis*, The Nations of the South Sea and the Protestant and Catholic Missions, Münster, 1847. Cf. "*The Catholic*," 1848. Missionary Journal, nros. 18, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 52, and 53. *Gams*, L. c., Vol. III., pp. 745-758.

[4] *Sion*, 1842, nro. 84.

[5] The first British settlement in Australasia was made in New South Wales in 1788; Tasmania was colonized in 1825, Western Australia in 1829, South Australia in 1834, New Zealand in 1841, Victoria in 1851, and Queensland in 1859.

rank, receiving *Ballarat*, *Sandhurst*, *Adelaide*, *Perth*, and *Hobart Town* as suffragan sees, whilst the metropolitan see of *Sydney* retains those of *Goulburn*, *Bathurst*, *Maitland*, *Armidale*, *Brisbane*, and *Victoria*. These splendid triumphs were achieved mainly through the Benedictines and Jesuits.[1] In the northern Island of New Zealand the sees of *Wellington* and *Auckland* have been established since 1849, and in the southern island that of *Dunedin* since 1869.

In *Western*, *Eastern*, and *Central Polynesia* apostolic vicariates have existed since 1853, the missionaries being chiefly engaged in converting the natives of the islands.

In Polynesia the Church is achieving marked success. Of the 3,000 inhabitants of *Uvea*, the principal of the *Wallis Islands*, 2,700 were Catholics in 1855. The missions on the *Gambier Islands* (Mangareva, Akena, Akamaru, and Taravai), conducted by the Priests of the *Congregation of Picpus*, are quite flourishing, and promise to become the centre of missionary enterprise in this part of the world, the missionaries having already extended their labours to the *Marquesas* and the *Sandwich Islands*.[2] Here, too, as in every missionary country in the world, the *blood of martyrs* has enriched the soil, and will become the seed of the faith. In the Wallis Islands Father *Chanel* was martyred by Muru-Muru, a bloodthirsty chief, May 28, 1841; Bishop *Epalle* was murdered by the savages of the Island of Isabella; and, in 1856, Father *Mozzuconi* and eighteen of the crew of the ship *Gazelle* met a similar fate at the hands of these sanguinary islanders. The English volunteered to send a man-of-war to punish the perpetrators of the murders on the Island of Isabella, but the missionaries declined the offer, saying: "*We do not avenge our martyrs; we pray for their persecutors.*"

The missions of Polynesia are organized into the apostolic vicariates: 1. Of the *Samoa* or *Navigator Islands*; 2. The *Marquesas Islands*; 3. *Melanasia* and *Micronesia*; 4. *New Caledonia*; 5. *Central Oceanica*; 6. The *Hawaiian* or *Sandwich Islands*; 7. *Tahiti* or the *Society* Islands; and the apostolic prefectures of the *Fiji Islands*, *New Norwich*, and *Labuan* Island, with its dependencies, off the north-western coast of Borneo.[3]

If there be any one fact, which recent events have brought prominently forward, it is that Europe and America are intent upon carrying their civilization and their intellectual culture to the farthest corners of the globe; and hence the Church has the acceptable duty imposed upon her, in this more than in any former age, of carrying the light of truth and the blessings of religion to the heathen of every land, and of keeping abreast of other civilizing influences, which, unless grounded upon the name and the faith of Christ, can have neither stability nor perpetuity. The rapid progress of the missions of the Catholic Church in these latter years seems to point to the approaching fulfilment of the words of prophecy: "He shall rule from sea to sea, and to the farthest ends of the earth."

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

Bibliography at the head of § 375. *Gieseler*, Review of the Theological Tendencies of the Last Fifty Years, Götting., 1837. By the *same*, Text-book of Ch. H., Vol. V. (from 1814 to the present time), Bonn, 1855. *Hundeshagen*, German Protestantism, Frankft. (1846); 3rd ed., 1849. *Schwarz*, Supplements to Actual Theology, Lps. (3rd ed.), 1864. *Vilmar*, The Theology of Facts opposed to the Theology of Rhetoric, 2nd ed., Marburg, 1856. *Baur*, Ch. H. of the Nineteenth Century (Vol. V.); *Dorner*, Hist. of Protest. Theology, p. 741 sq.. *Kahnis*, Interior Development of German Protestantism since the

---

[1] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, p. 56. (Tr.)

[2] Concerning the missionary operations in the Ladrones or Mariana Islands and the Caroline Islands, see *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 300-330. *Freibg.* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., art. "*Australia.*"

[3] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, 1877, pp. 62, 63. (Tr.)

Middle of the Last Century, Lps., 1860; *Gass*, Hist. of Protest. Dogmatics, Berlin, 1867; *Nippold*, Manual of Modern Ch. H., p. 213 sq. Protestantism in its Self-dissolution, Schaffhausen, 1843, signally Vol. II. †**Jörg*, Hist. of Protestantism during the Last Years, Freiburg, 1858, 2 vols. **Ritter*, Manual of Ch. H., 5th ed., Vol. II., pp. 575-601.

SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY AND OF THE CHURCH IN GERMANY.

§ 424. *Futile Efforts to preserve the Symbols of Protestantism.*

STARTLED by the novel teachings, which the writings of Bahrdt[1] were chiefly instrumental in bringing into existence and making popular, the orthodox Protestants, under the direction of pastor *Urlsperger*, first of Augsburg and subsequently of Basle (1775), formed a society for the promotion of sound doctrine and true happiness; and a similar society, for the defence of religion, was formed at the Hague in 1786. In Saxony the letters of *Krug* on the perfectibility of revealed religion, and the writings of *Eck*, in which their author pretended to explain the miracles of the New Testament by natural causes, were both prohibited by law. *Frederic William II.* of Prussia, acting under the advice of his Minister, *Woellner*, took still more decided steps to maintain evangelical Protestantism. On the 9th of July, 1788, he promulgated an *Edict of Religion* against the philosophical teachings that had found favour with Frederic II., forbidding them to be announced to the people from the pulpit. In 1790 the consistories were instructed to advance no one to an ecclesiastical position who held erroneous views on the fundamental truths of Christianity or who declined to accept the national catechism. Pastor *Hermes* and Professor *Hilmer*, of Breslau, were associated with Woellner to see that these provisions were carried into effect, and a Board of Examiners was formed in the Superior Consistory of Berlin, with instructions to exact of all pastors, professors, and school-teachers, before entering upon the duties of their several offices, a written declaration that they would carry out the instructions of Government. The trial of Pastor *Schulz* of Gielsdorf, and his deposition in 1791, produced quite a sensation. Many works were published on this occasion,[2] the chief topics under discussion being the extent of the binding force of the Symbols and of the jurisdiction of princes in matters of religion.

Frederic William III., on his accession to the throne in 1797, at once abolished the Board of Examiners, and proclaimed that everyone should have full religious freedom.

Kant († 1804), viewing the subject in quite a different light, rejected the superficial theology of his age, and in particular denounced its enfeebling influence upon the moral principle. He was from the

[1] Cf. § 377, p. 88.

[2] *Henke*, Animadversions on all the Writings, occasioned by the Prussian Edict of Religion, Kiel, 1793. See, above all, *Tholuck's* Miscellanea, Pt. II., p. 125 sq., and *Volkmar*, The Trial of Pastor Schulz, of Gielsdorf, Friend of Enlightenment in the Eighteenth Century, Exposed from the Judicial Acts, Lps., 1846.

first the consistent enemy of the popular philosophy of *Steinbart*, which degraded virtue by making it, not something valuable for its own sake, but only a means of acquiring happiness. Kant, on the other hand, aimed at giving a positive value to the moral principle. His works, as they are the beginning, so do they contain the underlying philosophical principles of the rationalistic theology of Germany. After having attempted to establish in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) that the human mind is incapable of knowing the highest truths with absolute certainty, he admitted in his *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) the existence of a *moral conscience*, which, he maintained, is the true basis upon which our conviction of the objective reality of a supreme moral law and of a sovereign good, which is the object of this law, can alone rest. In his work, entitled *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason* (1793), he applies to the Church and to the Christian dogmas his purely ethical religious conceptions, which are based solely on the moral law, to the exclusion of all metaphysics. According to his view, religion is only an aid to morality, and Christianity itself a school of morals. Practical reason, that is, reason within the limits of experience, is the one only source of religion, because it is the basis of the *moral law*, which, in its turn, unlike dogmatic truths, is *alone demonstrable* by reason, and should therefore be universally accepted.

The advocates of pure reason, thus assailed by Kant, did not consider themselves vanquished. *Flatt*,[1] among the theologians, and *Jacobi*,[2] († 1819), among the philosophers, at once rallied to its defence. Jacobi's theory was diametrically opposed to that of Kant. Kant admitted only a subjective reality; Jacobi affirmed that there was also an objective reality in such conceptions as God, the soul, immortality, and the like. Kant denied that faith is a source of knowledge in the strict sense to the reason; Jacobi held that there is an *interior revelation* or moral intuition, through which the intellect apprehends metaphysical truths as clearly and as firmly as it does those of experience through the medium of the senses, and that this revelation is the only source of our knowledge of divine things. The *objective realism* of Jacobi, and also the *æsthetical ideas* of *Fries*, exercised a marked influence upon theology. Still the teachings of Kant may be fairly considered the legitimate source of the theological system, which, since the time of *Reinhard*, has borne the name of *Rationalism*, and whose one supreme law is *reason*, or those natural endowments, which being possessed by all men are regarded as a sort

[1] *Flatt*, Essay of a Theory determining the Idea and Principle of Causality, and Laying the Foundation of Natural Theology, with Reference to the Philosophy of Kant, Lps., 1788. Letters on the Moral Foundation of Religious Knowledge, with Reference to the Philosophy of Kant, Tübingen, 1789. Observationes quædam ad comparandam Kantianam disciplinam cum chr. doctrina pertinentes, Tübing., 1792.

[2] *Jacobi*, Of Things Divine and their Revelation, Lps. (1811), 1822; Complete Works, Lps., 1812 sq., 6 vols.; Correspondence, Lps., 1825 sq., 2 vols. †*Kuhn*, Jacobi and the Philosophy of His Age, Mentz, 1834. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 756 sq.

of *natural* revelation from God. Since the death of Kant, his system has found many defenders. Among the ablest of these we may mention *Eckermann*, *Teller*, *Henke*, and *Tieftrunk*; *Roehr*,[1] General Superintendent of Weimar, its popular, and *Wegscheider*,[2] Professor at Halle, its dogmatic apologist; and *Paulus*,[3] Professor at Jena, and subsequently at Würzburg and Heidelberg, who gave to it an exegetical interpretation. Arrogating to themselves the title of champions of science and liberty, these learned but superficial men, by completely ignoring the historical character of divine revelation, and dealing with the Holy Scriptures flippantly and in bad faith, have given a fresh example to the world of the degradation to which reason may be reduced when, setting aside the light of lawful authority, it rises in its pride and becomes a guide unto itself. Their shallow and *coarse* rationalism, which will not accept anything except what falls under the senses and yet pretends to explain all things, while stripping Christianity of its deep meaning, has nothing of its own to offer to intellect, yearning for truths that will not pass away, or to souls languishing for light other than this world can give. "To treat Christianity with such levity," says *Schelling*,[4] "is not to understand, but to misunderstand it; is not to clear up its difficulties, but to brush them aside." And, speaking of modern rationalists, he adds: "They are men of little ability, and yet they are unbelievers; they are destitute of piety, and yet they wear a certain solemn gravity; they resemble those wretched spirits, placed by Dante in the vestibule of the infernal regions, who are rejected of heaven and shut out from hell. The one aim of their 'sound' exegetics, their enlightened psychology, and their tolerant morality seems to be to strip Christianity of all speculative depth and dogmatic truth of all certitude. According to them Christianity is a fact which must be subjected to the tests of history and experience, and its revelation a miracle, which must be explained by the criterions of sense. Now, since divine truth, because of its very nature, cannot be either known or demonstrated by experience, the advocates of naturalism are certain to have things all their own way."

But Schelling himself, being an avowed *pantheist*, could not consistently employ such language, and on another occasion he did not hesitate to pen these words: "One can scarcely rid one's self of the thought that the so-called Biblical Books are a great obstacle to the progress of Christianity. And, in matter of fact, their religious teaching cannot be compared for excellence with that of many works written both before them and since, and notably with that contained in the Vedas of the Hindoos."

[1] *Roehr*, Letters on Rationalism, Aix-la-Chapelle (Zeitz), 1813, and the Preacher's Critical Sermon-books, fr. 1820. Fundamental Dogmas of the Evangelical Church, Neustadt (1832), 1834.

[2] *Wegscheider*, Instit. theol. christ. dogm., Halæ, 1815; ed. VII., 1833.

[3] *Paulus*, Commentaries on the First Three Gospels, 3 vols., Heidelberg, 1830-1833: on St. John's Gospel; Life of Jesus, 2 vols., Heidelberg, 1828.

[4] *Schelling*, Lectures on the Method of University Studies, 2nd ed., p. 198 sq.

The *Hours of Devotion*, by *Zschokke*, a collection of soothing rhapsodies, published at Argovia from 1809, were at once the most complete and most popular expression of rationalistic exegetics;[1] and the unprecedented favour with which they were received was a melancholy proof of the spirit of indifferentism which everywhere prevailed. Luther had taught that man is justified by faith; here it was asserted that man is justified by *uprightness of conduct*, of which, however, one is to be himself the sole judge, thus fostering in his heart a spirit of pride and self-love.

A reaction, however, soon set in, and the principles of rationalism in religion were promptly met by a *supernatural system, based upon divine revelation*, as *set forth in Holy Writ*, and, in a measure, interpreted by the Catholic Church. The chief leaders, and mainly the defenders of this movement, were *Reinhard* († 1812), *Storr* († 1805), *Schwarz*, *Schott*, *Knapp*, *Tittmann*, and *Steudel*, besides nearly all the older-school theologians of Tübingen, including *Hahn*, *Tholuck*, and others, who, by putting prominently forward the divinely revealed character of the *historical* Books of the Bible, rendered a valuable service to exegetics.[2] Among these writers Tholuck was especially eminent for his great learning, the theoretical and practical character of his writings, and the influence which he personally exerted. Other theologians, like *Tzschirner* († 1828) and *Bretschneider* laboured to bring these two divergent tendencies together, and asserted that "rationalism and supernaturalism could exist harmoniously together without difficulty in the *Protestant* system," which is equivalent to saying that to differ in matters of faith is a dogma of Protestantism.

§ 425. *Influence of Modern Philosophy.*

The philosophical systems of *Schelling*[3] († 1854) and *Jacobi*, that of the former being in its new phase of a *positive philosophy*, pantheistic rather than Christian in its tendencies, exercised in their fuller development a marked influence upon theology. A powerful and permanent impulse was given to these systems by *Frederic Schleiermacher* († 1834), a theologian and philosopher, who received his education with the Moravians or United Brethren, making part of his studies in Upper Lusatia, and completing them at the University of Halle.

[1] Cfr. Criticism of the *Hours of Devotion*, Vienna, 1824. *Iven*, Anti-Christian Tendency of the Hours of Devotion, Cologne, 1827. The Hours of Devotion, a Work of Satan, by Dr. *G. Christlich*, Soleure, 1818. *Freiburg* Eccl. Journal, 1857, nros. 5-9.

[2] *Storr*, Christian Dogmatics, published by *Flatt*, Stuttg., 1803, 2 vols. *Reinhard*, A Course of Lectures on Dogmatics, published by *Berger*, 1801; by Reinhard himself, 1806; by *Schott*, 1818. *Schwarz*, Outlines of Protestant Dogmatics, 1816. *Knapp*, Lectures on Christian Dogmas, according to the Doctrine of the Evangelical Church, 1827. *Hahn*, Manual of Christian Faith, Lps., 1828. *Steudel*, Dogmas of the Protestant Evangelical Church, Tübingen, 1834. *Tholuck*, Doctrine of Sin and Expiation, 1823 sq.; Biblical Commentaries; Character of Rationalist Polemics, Halle, 1840; Miscellaneous Writings, Gotha, 1839, 2 vols.; His Works, ibid., 1862, 4 vols.

[3] *Ritter*, Hist. of Philos., Vol. XII.; *Freiburg* Theol. Journal, Vol. VIII.; *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. IX. and X.

He is the author of the *sentimental in religion*, and enjoys the questionable honour of having said that "*the different systems of religious philosophy, known as orthodoxy, pietism, and rationalism, have each rational grounds of defence.*"[1] *De Wette*[2] became his colleague, without, however, fully adopting his views. While the character of the teaching of these two men was, on the whole, rationalistic, they remained aloof from Rationalists, properly so called, by whom they were reproached with holding illogical propositions, and being pantheists in disguise. They replied: "You claim that reason is your supreme guide, and you have not yet been able to state scientifically what that reason is or what are its relations to religion." *Twesten* and *Nitzsch* of Berlin, *Charles Hase* and *Baumgarten-Crucius* of Jena, *Ullmann* of Heidelberg, and *Julius Müller* of Halle,[3] pursued a similar line of thought, all adhering more or less closely to orthodox teaching; while *Marheineke*, Professor at Berlin († 1846); *Daub* and *Rothe* of Heidelberg,[4] and *Baur* of Tübingen, were wholly under the influence of *Hegel*,[5] whose philosophy gave tone and colour to all they wrote. They particularly admired the Hegelian philosophy, the terminology of which had about it a certain biblical flavour, "because it made religion the one important thing, the knowledge of which in its essence is the perfection of wisdom; and because it taught that the Christian religion, in its ecclesiastical constitution, has a deeper and wider significance than modern Rationalism is willing to allow." It is certainly strange that men could *so completely* misconceive the true character of Christianity as to fancy that they were able to find its true spirit in the teachings of Hegel, who held that the Reason of *God* is impersonal, and becomes self-conscious only in the intellect of man, thus destroying at a blow both divine and human freedom, leading mankind back from the pure light of the Gospel to pagan darkness, and making *fatalism* (ἀνάγκη) the supreme arbiter of all things. According to Hegel, *evil* becomes necessarily manifest when the soul is occupied in developing its spiritual self-consciousness. Like his other teachings, his *apotheosis of the State* is also borrowed from Paganism.[6]

The essentially anti-Christian tendency of Hegel's philosophy became at once manifest on the death of its author. His disciples

[1] *Schleiermacher*, Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church, Berlin (1821), 1830 sq., 2 vols. Cfr. *Nippold*, Ch. H. of Our Own Days, pp. 213-239, with Bibliography concerning Schleiermacher.

[2] *De Wette*, Hist. Development of Christian Dogmatics, Berlin (1816), 1821, 2 vols.

[3] *Twesten*, Lectures on Dogma, from the Compendium of *De Wette*, 4th ed., 1838, 2 vols. *Nitzsch*, System of Christian Doctrine, Bonn, 1829 sq. *Hase*, Manual of Evangelical Dogmatics (1826), 2nd ed., Lps., 1838. *Ullmann*, The Impeccability of Jesus, 6th ed., Hamburg, 1853. *Julius Müller*, The Doctrine of Sin, 1389 sq.

[4] *Rothe*, The Beginnings of the Church and Its Organization, Wittenberg, 1843; Theological Ethics, ibid., 1845-1848, 3 vols.

[5] Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, published by Marheineke, Berlin, 1832, 2 vols.

[6] Cfr. *Staudenmaier*, Exposition and Criticism of the Hegelian System, Mentz, 1844.

divided into two schools, one of which denied outright the facts of Sacred History and even the immortality of the soul; while the other though still defending some religious truths, did so only because they regarded them as faithful expressions of the mind of their master. The leader of the former school was *David Strauss* of Tübingen, who had learned his theology from *Baur* and his philosophy from *Hegel*, and who, in his notorious *Life of Jesus*, carried the principles of historical criticism and rationalism, which were the legitimate product of Protestantism, to their last extremes; pronouncing the historical narrative of the New Testament a collection of *myths*.[1] This work, which, though audaciously negative in character, and containing little more than the arguments of so flippant a writer as *Edelmann*,[2] displayed unusual dialectical skill, and challenged the ablest Protestant theologians of the age to the defence of the person of Christ, as set forth in history. Their efforts were not uniformly successful, nor their arguments wholly convincing, and fears began to be entertained that teaching so utterly subversive of Christianity would exercise a most injurious effect upon the masses of believers, when an event took place that checked the current of infidelity. When Strauss was appointed to the chair of *Christian Dogma* at Zürich, the people rose in open revolt, and forced him to sever his connection with the university and withdraw from the city, thus depriving him of a prestige which such a position would naturally give.[3] The work of Strauss, it would seem, is the last we shall hear of the heresies relative to the Person of Christ, for it is itself a proof that nothing more can be said. Strauss' arguments have not even the merit of originality. His *Christology*, the central point of his dogmatic teaching, coincides literally with that of the Jew *Philo*, who represented Christ and the Logos as mankind, thus bringing the cycle of heresies to a close at the very point at which it started eighteen centuries ago.[4]

While the minds of men were thus straying farther and farther from the central truths of Christianity, there suddenly arose a party of daring thinkers and aggressive innovators, known as the party of *Young Germany*.[5] They changed the errors of Hegel on the development of God in history into a revolutionary and socialistic theory, and, while professing the coarsest Pantheism, advocated, in opposition

[1] *Bonn Review*, nro. 17, p. 250 sq. The Writings on the Life of Jesus, by *Strauss*, in *Rheinwald's* Repertory, art. I. and art. II. of the November nro., 1858. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 826-842.

[2] See § 377, p. 87, note 2.

[3] Cfr. "Dr. Strauss' Call to Zürich" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 321-349). *Gelzer*, The Discord occasioned by Strauss' Call to Zürich in 1839. Supplements to the History of Protestantism, Hamburg, 1843.

[4] *Strauss*, Christian Doctrine considered in its Historical Development and its Opposition to Modern Science, Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1840 sq., 2 vols. The Doctrinal Points Alone, in a Popular Exposition, by Philalethes, Constance, 1841 sq. According to Strauss, as well as according to Philo, the *Logos* is *Mankind*, when he said: σύμπαν ἀνθρώπων γένος. De somniis, lib. II. (Opp. ed. Mang., T. I., p. 683). *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 810-819.

[5] *Heine*, *Gutzkow*, *Laube*, and others. Cf. *Rheinwald*, Repertory, 1834, nro. 5.

to the spiritualism of Christianity, the complete emancipation of the carnal passions from all restraints. They gradually lost ground, and finally totally disappeared in the presence of determined opposition, but only to be succeeded by another school of the disciples of Hegel, whose organs were the *Annuary of Halle*, and the *German Annuary*, from 1840, edited by Arnold Rugé. Their teachings, which they defended with a startling disregard of the claims of reason, were closely allied to the theology of *Strauss*, and were, they said, to be erected on the ruins of Christianity, which was for ever overthrown. They asserted that the office of the Protestant Church was to destroy faith in the Christianity of the Gospel; that Luther was the forerunner of Hegel, who was immeasurably the superior of the great reformer; and that Protestantism, discarding even the methods of moral discipline and in alliance with *science and culture*, could continue to exist without the Bible, which is, after all, only a bundle of grotesque errors of every sort, sometimes affecting the most vital questions, and should therefore be cast aside as antiquated and misleading. After the failure of *Feuerbach*[1] and *Bruno Bauer*[2] to defend the religious views of Strauss, *Rugé* gave them a political and social application, frankly avowing, notably in his Programme of 1843, that liberalism had grown old and effete, and should be replaced by democracy and communism. *Herwegh*, a poet of Stuttgart, called upon the people "to cast the crosses down and make swords of them."

When this movement, which professed to be only a philosophical and political one, had failed of its purpose, a school of *coarse rationalists*, consisting of the disciples of *Wegscheider* of Halle, *Schulz* of Breslau, *Roehr* of Weimar, and *Paulus* of Heidelberg, sprung up, assuming the seductive title of *Friends of Enlightenment*. They set forth their teachings in the newspapers and proclaimed them by word of mouth at public meetings, in the hope of regaining among the masses and the so-called "*enlightened*" the ground they had lost on the battle-field of Protestant theology. Skilfully taking advantage of the agitation caused among Catholics by the *Rongian movement*, the principles of which were strikingly in accord with those of the new school, they pushed their claims with vigour and sometimes with success. The preachers, *Rupp* of Koenigsberg, *Uhlich* of Magdeburg, *Wislicenus* of Halle, and *Krause* of Breslau, who professed a superficial rationalism and put the most arbitrary interpretation on Scripture, had quite a numerous following. They formed new religious communities, in which not only the Lutheran and Calvinistic symbols were denied, but every shred of *positive* Christianity abhorred and rejected. Of this fact the *sermons* delivered by these apostles, the memorial accepted by the Congregation in charge of Dr. Rupp at Koenigsberg, and the declaration adopted by a *majority* of the representatives of the

[1] *Feuerbach*, Essence of Christianity, Lps., 1841. See *Criticism of this work in the *Freiburg Journal of Theology*, 1842, Vol. VIII., p. 151 sq.

[2] *Bruno Bauer*, The Evangelical National Church of Prussia and Science, 2nd ed, Lps., 1842.

new communities, to the effect that *the old form of administering Baptism "in the name of the Blessed Trinity" ought to be rejected, and one running "in the name of God and of the congregation" substituted,* afford abundant and convincing proof.

§ 426. *The Ultimate Results of the Free Interpretation of Holy Scriptures.*

Putting wholly out of sight the inspired character of the writings of the Bible, and utterly ignoring ecclesiastical teaching, *Semler* was the first to introduce the principles of absolute freedom in the interpretation of Holy Scriptures. Many writers like *Griesbach* (since 1785), *Lachmann* (since 1831), and *Tischendorf* (since 1840),[1] encouraged by the philosophic spirit of the age, employed this method in their works, and particularly in their introductions to the Old and New Testaments, where the authenticity of many of the Sacred Books, especially of the Old Testament, is assailed with shocking levity and a captious refinement of criticism. The Books of the New Testament, which had been vehemently attacked by *De Wette*, notably in his *Introduction*, and by the writers of the modern *school of Tübingen*, were defended by *Guericke*, *Ebrard*, *Thiersch*, *Reuss* of Strasburg, *Bleek*, and others;[2] while those of the Old Testament were defended by *Hengstenberg*, *Haevernick*, *Kurtz*, *Oehler*, *Bleek*, *Delitzsch*, and many more scholars of ability.[3] In the domain of philological interpretation, the works of *Ewald*, *Knobel*, *Hupfeld*, *Keil*, *Hitzig*, *Berthan*, and *Thenius*, to mention only a few, have considerable merit. *Winer*,[4] *Fritzsche*, *Meyer* of Hanover, and in a measure *De Wette*, *Bleek*, and *Holtzmann*,[5] undertook to defend exegetics against the prevalent sceptical spirit

[1] He died, December 6, 1874.

[2] *Guericke*, Materials for an Introduction to the New Testament, Halle, 1829; and Hist. and Crit. Introd. to the New Testament, Halle, 1843. *Thiersch*, Essay of a Critique of the New Testament from the True Historical Point of View, Erlangen, 1845; and a Few Words on the Authenticity of the N. T. Books, against *Baur's* work entitled, The Critic and the Fanatic, Erlangen, 1845. *Reuss*, Hist. of the Books of the N. T., 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864. *Bleek* (Professor of Bonn, † 1859), Introd. to the N. T., Berlin, 1862.

[3] *Hengstenberg*, Materials for an Introd. to the O. T., Berlin, 1831, 2 vols.; the Psalms, Christology of the O. T. (1829), Berlin, 1854, 3 vols.; and the Prophecies of Ezechiel, 1867 sq. *Hävernick*, Manual of Hist. and Crit. Introd. to the O. T., Erlangen, 1836 sq. *Kurtz*, Hist. of the O. T., Berlin, 1853 sq., 2 vols. *Ranke*, Investigations on the Unity of the Pentateuch, Erlangen, 1834 sq., 2 vols. *Oehler*, Prolegomena for the Theology of the O. T. *Bleek*, Introd. to the O. T., Berlin, 1865. *Delitzsch*, Theology of the Biblical Prophecies, Lps., 1845; on Genesis, 2nd ed., Lps., 1853; on the Canticle of Canticles, 1851, and on the Psalms, Lps., 1859; on Job, 1864; Isaias. Since 1863 he has been engaged with *Keil* in preparing a complete commentary on the O. T.; several volumes have appeared, and, like most of his works, have been translated and republished in Edinburgh. (Tr.)

[4] Grammar of the Primitive Idiom of the New Testament, Lps., 1822; 6th ed., 1855. *Buttmann*, Grammar of the Primitive Idiom of the N. T., Berlin, 1859.

[5] *Fritzsche*, Evangel. Matth. et Marci recensuit cum comment., Lps., 1826 sq., T. I, II., Comment. in ep. ad Romanos. *Meyer*, Critical Commentary on the N. T., Göttingen (1832), 1846 sq. *De Wette*, Abridged Manual of Exegesis for the N. T., Lps., 1836 sq., in several editions. *Bleek*, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 3 vols.; Synoptical Explanation of the First Three Gospels, 2 vols. publ. by *Holtzmann*

of the age, which was especially prominent in the writings of *Dr. Paulus* of Heidelberg, who attempted to explain away all miracles. These learned men set themselves to the special task of ascertaining by a close study of the *idioms* of the language in which the Books of the New Testament were written, and by the application of the rules of hermeneutics, the precise literal sense of what the writers had said, irrespective of the truth which the meaning conveyed or of its consequences, which, they said, was a question belonging to another branch of theology. *Usteri, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius,*[1] and others, by showing that the Biblical ideas are consistent one with another and hang well together, endeavoured to give an explanation of them which would be intellectually satisfactory and commend itself to the reason. Each, of course, had its peculiar way of viewing the subject, but their general drift was the same.

Exegetics in the meantime gained much in truth and dignity from the writings of *Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen,* and *Delitzsch,*[2] who sought their inspiration chiefly in the Fathers of the Church and from the arguments brought to light by a study of original texts. *Billroth* announced with classic pedantry "that if exegetics was to be successful in the third *stadium* of its race, it could not ignore modern philosophy," meaning Hegel's, but fortunately no one paid attention to his conceited statement.[3] The Selections from the *Bible, with notes,* commenced, in 1858, by *Ritter von Bunsen* († 1860), the well-known diplomatist and theologian, and continued by others, will also entirely fail of its purpose, which is to be a sort of popular book of instruction for the "*Christian Community.*" First of all, it lacks the simplicity and easy grace of style indispensably necessary in such a work; and, again, it is too diffuse to be read by the bulk of the people, who are influenced only by great underlying truths, which are at once essential and incontestable. That this work has unquestionable merit cannot be denied; but it is equally undeniable that, in spite of the "*reinstated higher criticism*" of which the author speaks so often and so complacently, and the *philological learning,* which is literally overwhelming, it is a disastrous failure for the purpose which it was specially intended to serve, which was to harmonize Biblical facts with modern ideas. The Bible, with doctrinal and homiletical notes by *J. P. Langen,*[4] assisted by *Schroeder, Fay, Bähr, Zöckler, Nägelsbach, Lechner,* and other writers, has been more successful.

[1] *Usteri,* Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 1833; Doctrine of the Apostle St. Paul. *Rückert,* Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans; to the Corinthians; to the Galatians. Among the posthumous writings of *Baumgarten-Crusius,* see his explanations of almost all the Books of the New Testament, Jena, 1845 sq., 4 vols.

[2] *Lücke,* Commentary on the Writings of St. John; Bonn, 1820 sq., 3 vols. *Tholuck,* Commentary on the Gospel of St. John; on the Epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews; on the Sermon of the Mount. *Olshausen,* Commentary on the N. T. unto the First Epistle to the Corinthians, inclusively, Konigsberg, 1836, continued and finished by *Ebrard,* 1854. *Delitzsch,* Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Lps., 1857.

[3] *Billroth,* Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, Lps., 1833, p. X.

[4] *Langen,* Bible, with Notes, O. and N. T., Bielefeld, 1857 sq.

§ 427. *The Theology of Compromise and Independent Theology.*

In the midst of these active disintegrating influences a school of theology sprung up, composed of men of eminent ability and high character, who entertained the illusory hope of uniting the conflicting parties by *compromise*. The leader of this school was the learned and amiable *Ullmann* of Heidelberg, subsequently of Carlsruhe, who was followed in the same line of thought by *Nitzsch* of Bonn and Berlin, in his *System of Christian Doctrine;* by *Julius Müller*, in his *Doctrine on Sin;* by *Albert Liebner*, in his *Christian Dogmatics from a Christological Point of View;* by *Dorner*, in his *History of the Development of the Doctrine relative to the Person of Christ;* by *Langé*, in his *Christian Dogmatics;* and by Bishop *Martensen* of Copenhagen, in a work bearing the same title as that of Langé.[1]

Viewing Christianity in the same light as Schleiermacher, not as a body of truths, but as an active creative principle, and regarding the Personality of Christ, or the *Godman*, as its central idea, Ullmann, impelled by a desire to be conciliatory, threw his cardinal tenet into this formula:[2] "*Christianity is divine in essence and human in form; divine in origin and human in development.*" This formula was directly opposed, and probably intended to be so, to the earlier school of supernaturalists, who held Christianity to be in every sense divine, superhuman, miraculous, and, from a historical point of view, inexplicable. These opinions did not meet with unqualified approval, even from Ullmann's own followers, and their expression was characterized by rationalists like *Baur* of Tübingen, as meaningless phraseology, which left all questions precisely where they were before, was calculated to serve no useful purpose, and was wholly illusory and misleading.[3]

Schwarz was still more harsh in his criticism of the opinions of Ullmann, styling them half-truths and useless concessions, and designating the whole system as a dishonest super-rationalism, in that its advocates, whom he characterized as eclectic philosophers, destitute alike of the ability and courage to form a new school,[4] while accepting the general principle of miracles antecedently, were anxious to get rid of them one by one in detail.

The Rationalists were, if possible, still more severe on the *Pectoral Theology of Neander* (*Pectus est quod theologum facit*), who, in his *Life of Jesus*, in reply to Strauss, fell into the glaring absurdity of professing to be a believer while he continued to criticise. The supernatural facts related in his *History of the Church*, it was said, would find a more fitting place in a collection of anecdotes.

The hostility to the advocates of compromise, who, because of

1 Translated from the Danish into German, 4th ed., 1858.
2 *Ullmann*, Essence of Christianity, 4th ed., Gotha, 1854.
3 *Baur*, Ch. H., Vol. V. (19th century), p. 405 sq.
4 *Schwarz*, Contribution towards the Hist. of Most Modern Theology, 3rd ed., pp. 371, 372

their pacific sentiments, were selected by preference to fill chairs in the universities and high ecclesiastical positions, grew daily more intense and bitter, and was especially directed against the theological faculties of *Göttingen* and *Halle*. It was mainly led by their own disciples, many of whom had grown into orthodox Lutherans. The *new Agenda* or Ritual, which was regarded as Catholic in tendency, and the ecclesiastical discipline introduced by the General Synod of 1855, evoked such a storm among the *liberal* students of Heidelberg that Ullmann was forced to resign his office of President of the High Consistory of Carlsruhe in 1860. Baffled in his plans and disappointed in his hopes, Ullmann ended his laborious life in 1865, while still in the prime of life and the full vigour of his intellectual powers.[1]

Dissatisfied with the theology of compromise, many divines were anxious to assume a more independent attitude, and to the views of such men *Richard Rothe* of Heidelberg († 1867), gave definite expression in his work entitled "*Theological Ethics*," which, in spite of its title, is dogmatic, rather than ethical in character, it being a methodically developed theological system, containing a strong theosophic element. The chief aim of the work is to replace by *theism* the pan theistic views of the world advanced by Schleiermacher and Hegel. He also gave special prominence to the theory of "*unconscious Christianity*," and offended many by reviving the doctrine concerning the "*merging of the Church in the State*," which, he said, was delivered to the *early Christian Church*. Putting aside the many vague and ambiguous statements of this author, we may sum up his idea of Christianity in his own words, which is that "*it is a pure and perfectly developed humanity, and the kingdom of God an association of religious and moral men*." As to any supernatural influence exercised by the Church on mankind, he does not say a word; quite the contrary, he maintains that humanity was gradually developed by the moral forces implanted by nature in the human race.[2] Between *Rothe* and *J. H. Fichte* of Tübingen, and *Weisse* of Leipsig, there was a certain affinity, which was developed by the former in his *Speculative Theology* (1846), and by the latter in his *Speculative Dogmatics*,[3] though neither of them was at all the equal of Rothe in speculative power or perspicuity of style. The leading purpose of Rothe was to prevent the intellectual horizon opened upon the view in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from being again narrowed, and to show that the old teaching concerning the Holy Scriptures and their inspiration, the doctrine of *St. Athanasius* on the Trinity, the definitions of the Council of Chalcedon on the "*communicatio idiomatum*" in the Person of Christ, and the *magical* (sic) effects of the Sacraments and the

[1] Cf. *Beyschlag*, Dr. Charles Ullmann, a Memorial, Gotha, 1867.

[2] Conf. *Althaus*, The Christ of Rothe (Periodical for Universal Theology and Church, 33rd year, nro. 2); *Von Solms*, Review of Theol. Speculation, according to *Rothe*, Wittenbg., 1872.

[3] 1855-1860, 2 vols.

doctrine of satisfaction, as set forth by St. Anselm, could never again be accepted as convictions by educated men. This same purpose was pursued with indefatigable labour and restless energy by *Baur* and the entire *New School*, which he had formed at Tübingen, and by *Schenkel* of Heidelberg; but was, however, only preparatory to an ulterior object, which was to assimilate modern philosophy with Christianity, *to abolish the Christian community as the Church of the people*, and to replace it by another, whose only profession should be a coarse and frigid rationalism, clad in vague and meaningless philosophical and theological phraseology. *Baur* set out by denying the authenticity of the Books of the New Testament, which he said were only a part of the popular literature in vogue in the first century and the early half of the second; and he was soon followed in the same line of argument by *Bruno Bauer*, *Zeller*, and *Schwegler*.[1] This attack he followed up by giving a rationalistic explanation of "Christianity as a religion of purely human origin," a task to which he brought an almost exhaustless store of erudition and a dazzling sophistry. He died in 1860, and was regarded by those who shared his views as second only to Schleiermacher.[2] If Christianity has not been stripped of its divine character, it is only to Baur to say that it was not his fault. He had a great admiration for *Apollonius of Tyana*, whom he did not hesitate to compare to Christ; but in supporting the comparison, it was but natural that he should fail as signally as *Philostratus*, the biographer of Apollonius, had failed before him.[3]

Daniel Schenkel, a native of Switzerland and a pupil of *De Wette's*, was regarded in the early part of his literary career[4] as belonging to the school of the theology of compromise, and on this account, owing mainly to the patronage of Ullmann, was called to fill a chair in the University of Heidelberg. It is said that his alienation from his early associates and his assumption of the character of a champion of Liberal Protestantism were in a large measure to be ascribed to the influence exercised upon his mind by *Bunsen's* work, "*The Signs of the Times*," and by the efforts of *Stahl*, a jurist of Berlin, to establish a hierarchy resembling in many respects that of the Catholic Church. "Between having my conscience tyrannized over by a despotic authority and obligatory symbols," said he, "and having it emancipated from restrictions and oppression that are alien to Protestantism, my choice cannot be doubtful."[5] He, however, stoutly affirmed that his theological convictions had undergone no change, but that the position of the theological schools had been reversed; and to prove his asser-

[1] *Bruno Bauer*, Criticism of the Gospel Narrative of the First Three Evangelists, Lps., 1841, 2 vols. Theological Annals, by *Zeller*; Contemporary Annals, by *Schwegler*; Hist. of Montanism (1841), and the "Post-Apostolic Age," 1846, 2 vols., by the same.

[2] Cfr. *Schwarz*, "Materials towards a Hist. of Modern Theology," 3rd ed., p. 148 sq., where he also mentions the principal works of *Baur*.

[3] Christ, and Apollonius of Tyana, Tübingen, 1832.

[4] *Schenkel*, *The Essence of Protestantism*, 1847; 2nd ed., 1862.

[5] *Schenkel*, Protestant Independence in Her Actual Struggle against Ecclesiastical Reaction.

tion he published his second and more considerable work, entitled *Christian Dogmatics*[1] *from the point of view of conscience*, a title which, aside from its vagueness, was borrowed from Bunsen, his opponent. Many of his theological critics claimed that, not only had he frequently lost sight of his avowed principle of freedom of conscience in treating his dogmatical propositions, but that many of these, instead of being in harmony with the *religious conscience of the age*, were merely reproductions of a theological school, which he himself had branded as antiquated, tyrannous, and enslaving. To escape this imputation he published, in 1863, his work "*On the Culture of the Evangelical Theologian*," in which he declared that the Protestant Church has no need of *priests;* that the *church of the people*, as at present constituted, recognizes no distinction of clergymen and laymen; and that, therefore, theologians should be no longer educated with a view to becoming the dispensers of the means of grace, but preachers of the Gospel, instructors of youth, guardians of the poor, and counsellors of those in distress.

The way was now prepared for the publication of his "*Picture of the Character of Jesus, a Biblical Essay*" (1864), which in its essential features is no less radical than "*The Life of Jesus*," by *Renan*, issued some time before. While denying the Divinity of Christ outright, he takes the airs of one to whom the teachings of Strauss and Renan give offence, and makes an *empty pretence of still believing in miracles.* Such expressions as these are frequent: "Here Dr. Strauss and I part company;" "*I am aware there is a point where reason must stop* (*!*) though our relations to the celestial powers continue uninterrupted;" "Here *faith* begins, *and here, too, I cease to reject miracles.*" But, while professing a general belief in miracles, he was careful, when those of the Gospel came up for discussion, one by one, to utterly destroy, in as far as he was able, their miraculous character, by subjecting them to the tests of rationalistic criticism. He gives a figurative interpretation of the marvellous miracle wrought by Jesus at the marriage-feast of Cana, saying that "Jesus, by the influence of his presence, changed the water of trivial and ordinary conversation *into the wine of elevated and glowing speech.*" He positively refuses to believe in "*the miraculous resurrection of the human body of Jesus,*" but still admits that after death He took upon Him a personal glory in a higher and more real condition of existence, and continues in his glorified Personality to exercise an influence upon the body of his disciples.

The ministers of Baden, to the number of one hundred and nineteen, together with all the orthodox Protestant ministers of Germany, entered a unanimous *protest* against the innovations of Schenkel, demanding at least his removal from the office of director of the Preachers' Seminary, to which, they said, he could not himself consistently object, as he had, for a like offence, been mainly instrumental

[1] 1858–1859, in two vols.

in securing the expulsion of Cuno Fischer from the University of Heidelberg, where he was only a private teacher of *philosophy*. Their protests were without effect. He was sustained by the High Ecclesiastical Council and by the Synod of Carlsruhe, on the ground that his teachings were entirely compatible with Protestantism. This is an authoritative admission that every heresy and the wildest aberrations of the human mind may all find a congenial home in the Protestant Church. But Schenkel was not so leniently dealt with by Strauss, who made him the victim of his "inexorable" criticism. After the appearance of the *Lives of Jesus*, by Schenkel and Renan, Strauss recast his former Life, and reissued it at Leipsig, in 1864, under the title of a *Life of Jesus for the German People*, and followed it up with a most scathing and savage pamphlet against Schenkel, entitled *Real Men and Pretenders* (Die Ganzen und die Halben.)

§ 428. *Revival of Lutheranism—Modern Orthodoxy.*

It was quite natural that the disintegrating tendency of the movement just described should evoke opposition and create a reaction, which, originating in practical religious life, gradually made its way into the field of science. The memory of Luther was revived, and tokens began to appear which pointed unmistakably to the growth of the religious sentiment. As these signs manifested their presence simultaneously in Germany and Holland, in Denmark and Switzerland, in England and in France, it would seem that the movement ought to be regarded as a sort of natural and necessary development.

In the midst of the political convulsions that marked the opening of the present century, *Schleiermacher*[1] reawakened spiritual fervour in the hearts of many; while the *romantic poetry* of the two Schlegels, of Tieck, of Novalis, and others, which carried men's minds back to the days of the Middle Ages and their inspiring and holy influences, and to the generous sacrifices made in the wars of liberation, kindled again the smouldering flame of religion in the breasts of the German people, and warmed their torpid piety to a glow. The centenary jubilees of 1817 and succeeding years, commemorative of the Reformation, served to bring before the minds of Protestants the strong contrast between the lethargy of their religious convictions and feelings and the strong faith and ardent piety of their ancestors. *Claus Harms*, a popular preacher of Kiel († 1855), in whom, it was said, religious feeling gushed forth with all the freshness of water from a mountain spring,

[1] *Discourses on Religion*, Addressed to Men of Culture, to Arm Them against Her Detractors, Berlin, 1799. *Monologues*, Being a New-Year's Gift to the Educated, Berlin, 1800; 4th ed., 1829. With both of these works form a strange contrast his "Confidential Letters," written at the *same time*, "on Lucinde" (a very obscene Romance by *Frederic Schlegel*), which (in a renewed separate edition by *Gutzkow*, Hamburg, 1835) caused a great sensation, and was the subject of the most diverse criticisms. In his "*Christmas Celebration*," published subsequently (1803), he already manifested his estrangement from the pantheism of Spinoza, and adopted the theological ideas, which he stated later on in his "*Doctrine of Faith*," Berlin, 1821.

was the first to give expression to the sentiments inspired by this revival. A thorough-going Lutheran of the primitive school, he published, on the occasion of the Jubilee of the Reformation, ninety-five theses, in which he not only repeated the Protestant doctrine of the utter depravation of man after the fall, and salvation by faith alone, but rebuked the religious indifference of Protestants, and insisted upon the necessity of returning to the unadulterated teaching of Luther. "I could write on the nail of my thumb," said he, with more truth than irony, "all the positive doctrines that are still believed." His seventy-fifth thesis was directed especially against the *alliance* proposed by Prussia *between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches*. In 1821, when a special Liturgy or "*Agenda*," containing what was called a "*neutral*" rite for the Eucharist, was granted to the Reformed Church, Claus Harms expressed his indignation in these words: "It is proposed," said he, "to bring by marriage a large dower to the Church of Luther, which is regarded as a handmaid. Beware that you do consummate this contract over the tomb where repose the bones of Luther. If you do, he may come to life again, and then woe to you."

The aim of the new school was briefly stated to be "a return from Rationalism to primitive orthodox theology, a going out from the desert of liberal philosophy into the Promised Land of the Reformation." Those who laboured most strenuously for the accomplishment of this design in Germany were: *Scheibel*, a professor at the University of Breslau; *Kellner* and *Wehrhan*, Silesian pastors, who sacrificed their positions to their conscientious convictions; *Heubner* of Wittenberg, *Sartorius* of Koenigsberg, and *Harless*, a professor at Erlangen, and subsequently General Superintendent for Bavaria, who, apart from the high position he occupied in the Lutheran Church, exercised a powerful influence over the minds of the better classes of men by his writings on *Ethics*, his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, his Theological Cyclopædia, and the journal entitled *For Protestantism and the Church*, of which he was the founder. The movement soon received another powerful ally in the *Universal Periodical of the Lutheran Church and Theology*, founded, in 1840, by *Guericke* and *Rudelbach;* while among the laity *Huschke*, the jurist, and the philosopher, *Steffens*, ably advocated the same cause. It is owing to the influence of these several causes, operating towards a definite end, that the theological faculties of the Universities of *Erlangen*, *Rostock*, and *Dorpat* have recently become strictly Lutheran in their teachings. Since 1825, *Grundtvig* has been labouring with equal zeal and ardour for the restoration of Lutheranism in Denmark, and in consequence was engaged in a spirited discussion with Professor *Clausen*, a devoted disciple of Schleiermacher's, on the questions which were so profoundly agitating the Church in Germany.[1]

[1] *Grundtvig*, Theol. Monthly. *Clausen*, On Catholicism and Protestantism, Copennagen, 1825; transl. from the Danish into German by *Fries*, Neustadt, 1828. 3 vols. Conf. *Jörg*, Hist. of Protestantism, Vol. II., pp. 314-356.

In opposition to those who desired the restoration of primitive orthodoxy and the symbols of Luther, there arose what was known as the neo-orthodox school, which, without placing itself in direct antagonism to the old Lutherans, advocated above and beyond everything else a *State religion and a State theology*. As such a theology was necessarily dependent on the religious whims and political views of princes, the Neo-Lutherans saw themselves obliged to change their religion every time they changed their ruler. The leading representative of this school was *Hengstenberg*, who, while attending a conventicle at Basle, in 1823, passed through the interior experience commonly known as "*getting religion*," after which he went to Berlin, where, in 1828, he, together with Schleiermacher and Neander († 1869), received an appointment as State Professor of Theology. He gathered about him a party of *pietists*, who, uniting with the intolerant spirit of Luther the fervid mysticism of Spener, rose rapidly in consideration among people of authority, rank, and distinction at the capital. Without holding any definite creed, Hengstenberg proclaimed himself, in the columns of the *Evangelical Church Gazette*, the champion of Protestant orthodoxy, and branded whoever differed from his views as a heretic, being particularly violent in his denunciation of the rationalistic theologians, *Wegscheider* and *Gesenius* of Halle, and *David Schulz* of Breslau. To the reproach addressed to him from many quarters, that his teachings were destroying the confidence which students had heretofore reposed in their professors, he promptly replied *that if the professor were a rationalist, to repose confidence in him would not be a duty on the part of the Christian student, but a sin.* In 1835 he broke faith with his former allies, who claimed to be "*loyal to their confession*," and became a warm supporter of the Prussian Evangelical Union. For this step he gave these reasons: "The difference," said he, "between the teachings of Luther and those of Calvin on the Lord's Supper are of no consequence; a confession of faith and theology is always sure to bring its own punishment. If the heart be filled with affairs of secondary importance, those of vital interest can find no place in it. And," referring to the Union, he added, "what God has joined ought not be put asunder." His opponents animadverted with caustic severity upon his conduct, reproaching him, among other things, with having "*arrogated to himself the character of a prophet, while he was in truth oscillating between that of a servile political parasite and an ecclesiastical demagogue.*"[1] Still it cannot be denied that Hengstenberg and the able and eminent laymen, like *Göschel*, *Henry Leo*, *Gerlach*, *Huber*, and *Stahl*, who shared his opinions and his labours, and whose tone was at times strikingly Catholic, have done much to preserve the divine and positive character of Christianity and its principal dogmas, to maintain Christian morality, to revive religious life, and to counteract the evil influences of free-thinkers and Freemasons.

[1] *Schwarz*, Materials in Aid of a History of Modern Theology, 3rd ed. p. 88

With a view to making a stand against the extreme consequences to which the opinions of Lutherans like *Vilmar* in Electoral Hesse, *Kliefoth* in Mecklenburg, and others, who took their inspiration from the officials of government, were leading, there arose another school, whose representatives, among whom were *Hofmann*[1] of Erlangen, *Kahnis* of Leipsig,[2] and *Baumgarten* of Rostock, demanded that *modern theology* should be subjected to fewer restraints, and that there should be a more unfettered application of the fundamental Protestant principle of *free inquiry*. Baumgarten had been at one time a disciple of Hengstenberg's, but was subsequently captivated by the mystical and theosophic teachings of Hofmann. Between all these men and *Delitzsch*, the learned commentator, *Kurtz* of Dorpat, and *Luthardt* of Leipsig, there were many points of contact and affinity. Hofmann was sharply rebuked for his arbitrary interpretations of Scripture and his doctrine of *atonement*, which was in direct antagonism to that set forth in the Symbolical Books; while the defection of Kahnis from Lutheranism produced a profound sensation and provoked the bitterest animadversion. "This man," said Hengstenberg, in a tone of angry complaint,[3] "with a hardihood quite unusual among theologians, has dared to raise doubts concerning the authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and to assail the Lutheran doctrine of the Trinity and the Last Supper. If one like him, smarting under disappointment, who has gathered from the refuse of Rationalism what he fancied to be sound doctrine, can make converts *among us*, then is our cause certainly hopeless." For a still smaller divergence from orthodox Lutheran doctrine, Baumgarten was deprived of his chair in the university.

Remark.—In *Niedner's* Manual of Christian Ch. H., ed. of 1866, pp. 898-904, and in **Dorner's* Hist. of Protest. Theol., pp. 861-887, a synopsis will be found of the extensive literary works in the different branches of theology, such as *Exegesis;* the *History* of Religion; *Dogmatics; Ethics;* Matters relating to *common and higher schools; Ecclesiastical functions; Sacred Poetry;* and *Hymnology*. For a more detailed account of works on *ecclesiastical history* between the years 1825 and 1850, *Engelhardt* may be consulted; and for the years between 1850 and 1860, *Uhlhorn*, in the *Journal of Hist. Theology*, founded by *Illgen*, and continued first by *Niedner*, and subsequently by *Kahnis*, from the year 1850 to 1861. It is a remarkable and encouraging fact that the study of Canon Law has in these latter years been revived, first by *Eichhorn* (1831), and perseveringly cultivated, both as a whole and in special branches, with promising success by Grolman (1832), *Richter*, (1841, 8th ed., by Dove, 1867), Bickell, Otto Mejer (3rd ed., 1845), Bluhme (1858, 2nd ed., 1868), *Wasserschleben*, Dove, *Hinschius*, Friedberg, Waitz, Roth, Hübler, and Sohm.

After the appearance of the works of *Augusti*, *Rheinwald*, and *Boehmer* (see Vol. I., p. 14, n. 2), considerable additions were made to the science of *archæology* by *Piper* in his *Monumental Theology*, preceded by an Introduction, and published at Berlin, 1867.

---

[1] On this subject he published his *Prophecy and Fulfilment*, 1841-1844, and his *Proof Drawn from Holy Writ*, 1852-1855, 3 vols.

[2] On the Interior Progress of Protestantism, 2nd ed., 1860; Dogmatics, 1861; The German Reformation, Leipsig, 1872.

[3] In the New Year's number of his Ecclesiastical Journal for 1862.

§ 429. *The More Important Religious Movements of Germany.*

(*A.*)—IN PRUSSIA.

1. The steadily increasing danger to Protestantism, resulting from divergencies of opinion so various and conflicting, upon subjects so vital and essential as the faith of a church and its authoritative expositions, set Protestants to thinking, and caused them to long for union among themselves.

Between the years 1798 and 1817, and again between 1817 and 1829, and from that day to this, the Royal House of Prussia has laboured unceasingly to bring about a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. In a cabinet order of July 18, 1798, the hope was expressed that the two confessions, if they could not unite in doctrine, would at least adopt a common liturgy. This project miscarried, owing to the influence of political events and the determined opposition it met with from theologians. In the royal edict of Frederic William III., addressed to all the consistories, synods, and superintendents of his kingdom, ordering the celebration of the third centennial jubilee, it was stated, though hardly meant, that the very idea implied by the Reformation and the spirit evoked by Protestantism *were in themselves sufficient bonds of union.* There was, it was said, no thought of transforming the Lutheran into the Reformed or the Reformed into the Lutheran Church, but simply to form of the two *one evangelical church, in which the spirit of their founders should be renewed!* Notwithstanding that no formulary could be devised sufficiently elastic to embrace both these branches of Lutheranism without destroying some portions valued by each, the idea of union on some basis daily gained ground. The union was first realized by the ministers resident at Berlin, whence it made its way slowly into other countries, and was accepted in Rhenish Bavaria, in 1819; in Würtemberg, in 1820; and in Baden, in 1821. In 1822 a *Liturgy* or *Agenda* was published by royal authority for the use of the Court Chapel and Cathedral Church of Berlin, and its general adoption recommended. From a cabinet order of May 28, 1825, we learn that 5,343 churches, out of 7,782, complied with the king's request, and introduced the Liturgy. It was, however, soon assailed on the ground that it tended to mix up the affairs of the State with the affairs of the Church, and that it was antiquated both in matter and form, and contained a strong element of Catholicism. A heated discussion followed, some contending "that the Union was the natural result of advanced culture, and not the arbitrary work of the will of men," an assertion of which *Schleiermacher* claimed he had furnished abundant proof in his *Exposition of Faith;* while others denounced the frequent changes of doctrine on the *Lord's Supper* and *Predestination*, and characterized the Union as a merely exterior and meaningless act, having no foundation other than that of torpid indifference. A revised edition of the Liturgy, which appeared in 1828, containing supplements adapted to the local peculiarities of Pomerania, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Silesia, had the effect of temporarily suspending the discussion.

Nevertheless, the agitation against the Union, started by *Claus Harms*, was continued by *Scheibel, Kellner*, and *Wehrhan*, in *Silesia*, and by Guericke, Rudelbach, and others, in *Saxony*. In Silesia the opposition was put down by an armed force, headed by the orthodox *Dr. Hahn*, who was subsequently appointed Superintendent-General. *Dr. Hengstenberg* reproached his former colleagues with advocating an exclusive and bigoted form of Lutheranism, comparing their course to that of men who had suddenly awoke after a sleep of three hundred years.[1] The quarrels thus introduced among the orthodox Lutherans and the severe measures taken by Frederic William III. to repress the opposition of the "*rebels*" continued to retard the work of Union, and in the meantime the king died "*in trouble*" (1840), but not until he had made Protestants and Catholics alike feel the full weight of his despotism.

2. From his successor, *Frederic William IV.*, both Churches looked confidently forward to a more liberal policy, and their hopes were not disappointed. Personally the king was well-disposed towards the oppressed Lutherans, and the abortive attempt made by him, in concert with the Archbishop of Canterbury, to establish the Anglo-Prussian

[1] See Vol. I., p. 340.

bishopric of St. James in Jerusalem[1] also operated in their favour, it being very generally condemned in Germany.

The Archbishops of Cologne and Posen, together with a number of Old Lutherans, who had been cast into prison by his father, were now set at liberty by order of Frederic William; and, with his permission, granted July 23, 1845, a number of Lutheran *Separatist Churches* were organized. As a further step towards granting the Lutheran Church liberty to govern itself, the king convoked a *General Synod*, to convene at Berlin, August 29, 1846, consisting of thirty-seven representatives of the clergy and thirty-eight of the laity, under the presidency of the Minister of Worship. The subjects brought forward for deliberation, which were first distributed to eight Committees and discussed in sixty Plenary Sessions, were the following: (*a.*) *Union.* The report on this subject was made by Julius Müller of Halle, and a resolution carried to the effect that the *consent* of the parties was the only legal basis for "the establishment of an Evangelical Church." (*b.*) *Creed*, or the obligation of the clergy to make some confession of faith. This subject was reported by Nitzsch of Bonn, who proposed that a formulary, which had been drawn up, and consisted of extracts from Holy Scripture, but contained no definite doctrinal teaching, should be accepted by all persons taking *Orders* for the future. The suggestion was adopted. (*c.*) *Constitution of the Church.* On motion of Stahl, who reported this subject, it was resolved that the Council of Presbyters and the consistories should be composed of clerical and lay members, and that, besides the Permanent Consistory, there should be a General Synod, in which the clerical and lay bodies should be equally represented.

The decisions of the Synod met with determined and powerful opposition, particularly from *Hengstenberg's Ecclesiastical Gazette.* It was denounced as a Robber Synod, and its members stigmatized as faithless custodians and traitors to Christ, and it was found impossible to carry into effect the decrees passed by the majority.

3. In opposition to the orthodox and pietist "*Obscurantists*," who were growing daily in numbers and influence, there arose the party styled the "*Friends of Enlightenment*," who, under the direction of their leaders, *Rupp*, *Wislicenus*, and *Uhlich*, founded "free religious communities" at Koenigsberg and Magdeburg and in Thuringia. They prospered as long as they were not interfered with by Government, and skilfully took advantage of the agitation caused by the "*German Catholics.*"[2] They professed what they designated as a practical Christianity, based upon a rationalistic interpretation of the Bible, and in harmony with the progress of the nineteenth century. With the members of the *New School of Progressists at Tübingen*, they pronounced the labours of Christian missionaries, whether Protestant or Catholic, in both hemispheres, utterly useless, on the ground that the work would be done quite as well and better by the march of civilizing influences and the wisdom of pagan schools.

4. The mystical and pietistic sects that sprung up here and there, and of which further mention will shortly be made, were in every sense directly opposed to those of which we have just been speaking:

(*B.*)—OUTSIDE OF PRUSSIA.

In other countries of Germany outside of Prussia, religious movements also took place which reflected the peculiar characteristics of their several authors. In *Mecklenburg*, a party under the influence of the rigid Lutherans, *Kliefoth* and *Mejer*, made vigorous and persevering efforts to restore the Lutheran dogma, worship, and discipline; and in *Bavaria* a similar movement was set on foot by *Harless*, in concert with the *Lutheran* Faculty of Theology at Erlangen. Here it seems to have been in a large measure successful, for Professor *Thomasius*,[3] a man of learning and high character, gave an encouraging report of "the revival of evangelical life in the *Lutheran* Church of Bavaria." In the Bavarian Palatinate of the Rhine, however, even the ardent zeal of *Ebrard* was powerless to effect a return to the older Symbols. The members of the Reformed Church organized and protested against the decisions of the General Synods of 1853 and 1857, rejected the *new Catechism* and the *new Book of Hymns*, and demanded the maintenance of the Union, which imposed upon them no definite profession of faith. "Desirous of living in peace

---

[1] See § 423, p. 320.

[2] See p. 311 sq.

[3] *Thomasius*, Fragment of the *Eccl. Hist. of South Germany*, Erlangen, 1867. Origenes, Being a Supplement to a Hist. of Dogma, Nürnberg, 1867. Evangelical, Lutheran Dogmatics, 1857 sq.

with his people," King Maximilian carefully abstained from using any compulsory measures.

Prelate *Ullmann* encountered an opposition not less obstinate than that against which Ebrard had struggled in vain, when, after the condemnation of *Hebel's Bible History*, he attempted to introduce in the Grand Duchy of Baden the Lutheran Catechism and that of Heidelberg and a corresponding *liturgy*.[1]

The reiterated efforts to force the preachers of the Duchy of Altenburg and the Grand Duchy of Hesse to adopt the *Symbolical Books*, or at least the work entitled *Positive Christianity*, as a guide for the education of youth and the instruction of the people, were all signal failures.[2]

In *Electoral Hesse*, the conflict between the Lutherans and Calvinists for the ascendency was bitter and persistent. It would seem that the recent work of *Dorner* has had the effect of allaying the animosity called forth by these discussions, and of facilitating the accomplishment of the designs of Prussia with regard to the *Union* of sects.[3]

§ 430. *Religious and Charitable Societies.*

After the learning of theologians and the diplomacy of princes had proved inadequate to accomplish the work of Union, more practical means were resorted to and frequently with success.

1. The *Evangelical Conference*, convened at Berlin, in 1846, at the instance of the Governments of Würtemberg and Prussia, pursued the course that had so often proved futile, confining itself to the vague statement that the Scriptures should be accepted as the rule of belief and saving doctrine, and the dogma of *justification by faith* retained. The *Ecclesiastical Conference*, which subsequently replaced it, and has, since 1852, been holding its sessions at regular intervals at Pentecost, first annually, and more recently every second year, in Eisenach, at the foot of the *Wartburg*, proposed to itself a more definite work, such as collecting statistics of churches, compiling canticles worthy of preservation, and revising and harmonizing with the spirit of the age Luther's translation of the Bible.

2. In 1845 the *Evangelical Alliance*, consisting of "Evangelical Christians belonging to various churches and countries," associated together for the purpose of "concentrating the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism, and to promote the interests of Scriptural Christianity," was formed in England. Its first meeting, attended by the Evangelicals of Great Britain and Ireland, was held at Liverpool in October, 1848, whence it spread to the more important cities and towns of these countries, and branches of it have been established on the Continent of Europe and in the United States. It met with favour from Frederic William IV., at whose invitation one of its general meetings was held at Berlin, in 1857. Similar meetings were held at Paris, in 1855; at Geneva, in 1862; and at New York, in 1873. The alliance has been uniformly opposed by the High Church party in England, and by both Lutherans and Rationalists in Germany, while in the United States many were deterred from entering it, previously to the Civil War, owing to its attitude towards slavery.

3. The Protectory, known as the "*Rauhe Haus*," founded, in 1833, near Hamburg, by *Wichern*, as a refuge for abandoned or neglected children, was an eminently successful enterprise, received the approbation of the Protestant Ecclesiastical Synod, held at Wittenberg, in 1848, and has ever since been doing a deal of good.

4. The *Institute of Deaconesses*, founded, in 1836, at Kaiserswerth, by *Fliedner*, a Protestant preacher, on the model of the Catholic Sisters of Charity, has also prospered. There are many houses of them in Germany, and similar societies exist in England and the United States, under the name of Ladies' District-visiting Societies, Dorcas Societies, &c. Colonies of the Institute of Fliedner went even to Jerusalem, Smyrna, and Alexandria. They serve the sick, visit prisoners, have charge of reformatory houses for Magdalens and lunatic asylums, and co-operated with the "*Knights of St. John*," restored

---

[1] See § 427.

[2] Cf. *Baltzer*, Attempts at Reconciliation, &c., Nro. II., pp. 73-75. *Bretschneider*, The Insufficiency of Compulsory Measures to have the Symbol adopted in the Evangelical Church demonstrated from the Symbolic Books Themselves, Lps., 1841.

[3] Cf. †*Hagemann*, Hist. of Protest. Theology viewed in the Light of Criticism, Bonn 1867.

by Frederic William IV., in caring for the sick and wounded on the battle-fields of Slesvig-Holstein, Bohemia, and France.

5. A very extensive association has been formed for the relief of Protestants living in Catholic countries. Its name has a flavour of intolerance about it. It is called the *Gustavus Adolphus Association*, from the fact that it was organized by *Grossmann* of Leipsig, in 1832, on the second centennial anniversary of the death of Sweden's great king, whose claim to be styled the Protector of Protestantism in Germany is, however, very doubtful. *Zimmermann* of Darmstadt, succeeded to Grossmann as the leading spirit of the Association, which, in spite of its rather unpatriotic name, might be regarded as no more than a peaceful rival of the Catholic Saint Boniface Society, except for the fact that its directors seize every possible occasion to display their intolerance, which is painfully manifest in the publications known as the *Gustavus Augustus Calendars*. The Association rapidly made its way to public favour, and has in consequence immense means at its disposal. Up to the present time it has disbursed 220,000 thalers in Rhenish Prussia, 157,000 in Hungary, 142,000 in Bohemia, 120,000 in Austria Proper, and 124,000 in Moravia, Carinthia, and Styria, all of which is applied to building churches and promoting the general interests of Protestantism.

6. Finally, a number of preachers, devoted to the older and more orthodox forms of Lutheranism, met in the Chapel of the Castle of Wittenberg, in 1848, and founded an association for the purpose of fostering the principles of faith and making a stand against the prevalent decadence of the times. Its aims and its progress were brought before the public by means of meetings held every second year, at which *Bethmann-Holweg* and *Stahl* usually presided. The association met successively at Wittenberg, Stuttgart, Elberfeld, Bremen, Berlin, Frankfort, Lübeck, Hamburg, Barmen, Brandenburg, Altenburg, and Neustadt on the Hardt (1867). At the outset its members professed a positive form of belief, but as time went on, the effects of the corroding spirit of dissolution inherent in Protestantism began to appear, and the only link that continued to hold them together was their common hatred of the Catholic Church. Finally, during the presidency of *Bluntschli*, and on the motion of Professor *Holtzmann* of Heidelberg, "the teachings of Schenkel were declared to be authorized by the Protestant Church," the decrees of the General Assembly of Carlsruhe (1867) approved, and the protests of the clergy of Baden disregarded and repudiated.

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM OUTSIDE OF GERMANY.

For bibliography, see *Niedner's* Manual of Church History, ed. of 1866, pp. 921-929, and Dr. *Chas. Hase's* Hist. of the Christian Church, 9th ed., pp. 622-645; Engl. tr., New York, 1873, p. 597 sq.

§ 431. *Protestantism in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, France, Great Britain, and America.*

The influence of German theology was first felt in *Denmark*, where it was propagated by *Clausen*, a disciple of Schleiermacher's, who, though a deputy and minister of State, was an ardent student of divinity, and by *Münter* and the two bishops, *Martensen* and *Mynster*. When, in 1826, Clausen was brought to trial and condemned on the complaint of *Grundtvig*, as a fomentor of idolatry, he threw up his parochial charge; but this only increased his activity to promote the increase of illegal religious conventicles. With the assistance of *Kierkegaard*, he finally succeeded in establishing a *national* church, fiercely opposed to religious innovations of every kind from Germany, and the centre of a determined hostility against the *Lutheran* clergy, the representatives of the Established Church of Denmark. Through his persevering efforts, between the years 1855 and 1857, liberty of conscience was granted to the Danish people, who were no longer legally obliged to attend the services of the State church or to have their children baptized by its ministers. The Catholic Church also reaped the benefits of this agitation and its results.

In *Sweden* the position of the Church is quite different. Here the influence of German theology has been hardly felt outside the lecture-room. The infamous laws of 1686 operate equally against *Dissenters* and *Catholics*, and conversion to Catholicism is punished with banishment. Since 1803 the enactment of 1726 against religious conventicles has been rigidly enforced in the case of the Pietists, who, because of their assiduous reading of

the Bible and the works of Luther, have received the name of *Läsare*. Fines and imprisonments are the punishments usually inflicted upon them; but in *Finmark*, where the people are poor and enthusiastically religious, the law has entailed extreme hardship, as those of the inhabitants who choose to remain loyal to their convictions have been forced to part with their reindeer to satisfy its exactions. In many instances, however, the laws have been leniently enforced or their infringement prudently overlooked. "Bishop" *Esaias Tegner*, by his writings, and notably by his *Frithiof's Saga*, has acquired some fame as a poet.

Between *German Switzerland* and Germany the relations have been more intimate. German theologians held professors' chairs at the Universities of *Basle*, *Berne*, and *Zürich*, and Swiss theologians in turn at many of the Universities of Germany. Of the former, it will be sufficient to instance *De Wette* at Basle, Otho Fridolin *Fritzsche* and *Keim* at Zürich, and *Gelpke* at Berne; and of the latter, *Gelzer* at Berlin, *Herzog* at Erlangen, and *Schenkel* at Heidelberg. There were also many Swiss theologians, who became prominent at home in the religious movement, among whom were *Hagenbach* of Basle, and *Alexander Schweitzer*, *Böhringer*, *Henry Lang*, and *Hirzel* of Zürich. In Switzerland, a republican constitution, the right of congregations to select their own pastors, and the absence of any obligation to believe in symbols, all contributed to foster extreme views in religion. That the same spirit that pervaded practical life was also dominant in the schools is evident from the fact that *David Strauss* was called to Zürich, in 1839, and *Zeller* to Berne, in 1847, to teach theology. From the wealthy city of Basle, the seat of numerous *missionary* and *Bible societies*, multitudinous tracts have been issued and scattered all over Germany, with a view to propagating *modern pietism*. But, as we shall see in a subsequent paragraph, this city was also the home of *tendencies the most divergent* and of parties the most antagonistic.

Between the people of German Switzerland and *Holland*, or that portion of the Alpine country inhabited by a German population, and the lowland regions lying along the Rhine from its source to its mouth, there exists now as formerly a close resemblance and affinity. In both these countries, in which the *Reformed* is the dominant religion, one meets with the most devoted attachment to rigorous formularies and symbols of faith, existing side by side, with a readiness to adopt the most extreme theological views. This latter tendency has been fostered in Holland by the *Voices of the Times*, a periodical, since 1859 published in Switzerland. The poets, *Bilderdyk* and *Isaac da Costa*, appealed urgently to their countrymen to return to the more primitive orthodox teachings of their Church; while the young clergyman, *Henry de Cock*, warmly defended the decrees of the famous Synod of Dordrecht,[1] threatening that, if they were not adhered to, he and the numerous body who shared his opinions would separate from the national church. In consequence the *Separatists* were arrested, fined, and imprisoned, as disturbers of the peace, until 1839, when they were permitted by royal order to establish *Christian Separatist Congregations*. When, in 1848, the principle of religious freedom was granted as a part of the radical reforms in government introduced in that year, the *Independent Synodal System* was organized. By this arrangement all ecclesiastical affairs are submitted to the action of a *General Synod*, which meets annually at the Hague, and to which ten provincial synods and the Three Theological Faculties of Leyden, Utrecht, and Gröningen, send delegates. The General Synod also appoints a Commission, by which all business is transacted in the interval between the sessions of that body. Since then there has been a very decided tendency visible among the Dutch theologians towards more independent views in ecclesiastical affairs and a greater attachment to *evangelical* theology.

Mention should also be made, in connection with the Separatist movement led by De Cock, of the *Lutheran Re-established Church*, founded at Amsterdam in 1791; of the religious community called "*Christo sacrum*," founded at Delft between the years 1797 and 1801; and of the *Niemoe Litchtess*, a sort of Quakers, founded in 1845.[2]

There are also many points of resemblance between *French Switzerland* and that portion of *France inhabited by Calvinists*, the explanation of which is to be sought in the common origin of the religion of both districts and in the similarity of the language and manners of the people. In *Geneva*, the citadel of Calvinism, the influence of J. J. Rousseau caused a noticeable deterioration of the high standard of Christian morality

---

[1] See § 340, Vol. III., p. 413.

[2] They took as the underlying principle of their creed the words of Acts, iv. 12.

previously maintained. Simultaneously with the celebration of the centennial jubilee in honour of the Reformation, a number of zealous preachers, associated under the common name of the "*Vénerable Compagnie*," avowed themselves the ardent advocates and defenders of the fundamental doctrines of *Orthodox Calvinism*. At this time also *Madame de Krüdener*, a woman of unusual spirit and considerable influence with several princes, became the head of a sect composed of Swiss Calvinists and English Methodists, who advocated a revival of "*Evangelical*" Christianity, and were contemptuously called *Momiers*. They were hated and in some instances violently assaulted by the people, whose innocent amusements they denounced, and persecuted by the Government, by which they were regarded as Separatists. After the Revolution of 1830, however, when religious freedom was proclaimed, the persecution ceased, but a reaction set in against them, which took definite shape in *The Evangelical Society of Geneva*. Under the auspices of this Society a college was founded and placed under the direction of the learned and zealous *Merle d'Aubigné*, for the education of rigidly orthodox ministers. In 1835, the jubilee, commemorative of the introduction of the Reformation into Geneva, was celebrated with great pomp and circumstance. By the Revolution of 1846 the Evangelical Society was overthrown, and the administration of the affairs of the National Church vested in a *Consistory*, whose members were elected by the Congregations. It had also been rigorously inculcated by the orthodox theologians of Berne that the Church was absolutely dependent upon the State; but *Vinet*, at Lausanne († 1847), and the adherents of the "*Free Church of the Canton of Vaud*" began an agitation in favour of the contrary doctrine, which gradually gained ground among the clergy, who, as time went on, lost their official character.[1] Liberal religious views spread so rapidly and became so generally diffused among the Calvinists of Switzerland that at the ter-centennial anniversary of the death of their founder, in 1864, they repudiated his claim to the title of a national hero, and emphatically protested against his religious system as cruelly despotic.[2]

By the two revolutions of 1830 and 1848, but chiefly by the prevalence of modern ideas, the condition of Protestants in *France* has been greatly ameliorated, and, as a consequence, their number has largely increased, and they now carry on an active propagandism publicly and without restraint. They were at one time so hopeful that their intention of converting the entire country was boastfully announced from Geneva. *Il faut évangéliser la France*, they said, but their progress was arrested by dissensions within their own body. Among the most active and potent organizations of these sectaries was the *Société évangélique*, founded at Paris, in 1832, which, mainly through the influence of the newspaper *Le Semeur* and that exerted by *Vinet* at Lausanne, was at one time quite numerous. Its agents made themselves so offensive by ostentatiously hawking Bibles and tracts containing libelous slanders on Catholics and members of the Reformed Church, that the police were obliged to interfere in the interests of public peace, and for a short interval the Société was under the ban of the law. Another of these organizations is the *Union des églises évangéliques de France*, founded, in 1848, by Count *Gasparin* and *Frederic Monod*. These sectaries, who profess a sort of symbol, composed of selections from the devotional portions of the writings of St. John and St. Paul, are most malignant in their hostility to the Catholic Church, because her priests receive a salary from the Government. Other organizations were formed of a kindred character, and professing either Methodist or Baptist doctrines, but by no means of equal importance.

Diametrically opposed to all these was the ultra-rationalistic party, represented by men like *Pécaut*, *Réville*, and the younger *Coquerel*, and some time later by *Edmond Scherer* and *Colani*, who, being disciples of the Tübingen school of Baur, denied the divine origin of Christianity and controverted the authenticity of its miracles. The outcome and fullest expression of the tenets of this school was *The Life of Jesus* and other works on the origin of Christianity by *Renan*. It was successfully opposed by M. *De Pressensé*,[3] in his numerous writings, and by M. *Guizot* († 1877), at one time Minister of State, in his *Méditations* and *Eglise et société crétienne*. At the last Synod, held in Paris

---

[1] Conf. *Herzog's* Encyclopædia, Vol. XVII., art "*Vinet*," pp. 766-820.

[2] See § 321, Vol. 3, p. 286.

[3] *Edmond de Pressensé*, Histoire des trois premiers siècles de l'église, 4 vols., Paris, 1858-1861; Jésus-Christ, son temps sa vie et ses œuvres, 3rd ed., 1866; Le Concile du Vatican, 1872; La liberté religieuse en Europe en 1870, Paris, 1874; La vie morale des premiers chrétiens, 1875. The first two works have been translated into German and other languages. He is the chief editor of the Revue chrétienne, which he founded. The bulletin théologique forms a supplement to it.

in June, 1872, Colani and Coquerel were vehemently attacked by M. De Pressensé, who triumphantly vindicated on that occasion the supernatural character of Christianity. When the *Orthodox Profession of Faith* was submitted to the Synod, it was found that there was a numerous minority of Materialists, or, as they prefer to call themselves, Liberals, against it; and it only passed by a majority of sixteen, the vote standing sixty-one affirmative and forty-five negative. But in charitable associations, in which French Protestants have attempted to rival Catholics, the results have been more encouraging, and much good has been done through their agency.

Among the *Theological Faculties* the most eminent are, first, the Orthodox Calvinistic Faculty of *Montauban*, and next the Lutheran Faculty of *Strasburg*, which, being in close contact with the science and literature of Germany, have produced works of exceptional excellence. The writings of their more distinguished representatives, such as *Matter, Schmidt, Baum*, and, above all, *Reuss*, have received high praise from German scholars.[1]

Since the opening of the century the *Established Church of England* and *Kirk of Scotland* have displayed remarkable energy, and have been unusually active. The bishops of the Established Church, possessing comfortable livings and enormous revenues, and strengthened by their alliance with the aristocracy, for a long time obstinately refused to yield to the demands of the Dissenters, or, in obedience to the wishes of Government, to make the changes which, it was urged, the circumstances of the age rendered necessary and peremptory. As a consequence, the two branches of the Establishment, the *High Church* and the *Low Church*, or the Evangelicals, grew daily more hostile to each other; and while the Evangelicals denounced the *Catholic* tendencies of the High-Churchmen, the High-Churchmen denounced with equal vehemence the *Protestant* tendencies of the Evangelicals. In 1833 a rally was begun in favour of High Church principles, which issued in what are known as the *Tractarian* or *Puseyite* and *Ritualistic* movements, the former headed by Dr. *Newman*, Dr. *Pusey*, *John Keble*, and other Oxford men, and both having the effect of leading many into the Catholic Church.[2] These events still further incensed the *Evangelicals*, who, availing themselves of the excited state of religious feeling produced by the late Methodist agitation, renewed their demands and extorted some concessions from the Anglican bishops. The position of both rectors and curates was much improved, and the spiritual wants of the people better served. Extraordinary efforts were made by both parties for the *propagation of Christianity* and the diffusion of the *Bible;* numerous churches were erected and distress of every kind relieved. Attention was also given to Christian morals, which were everywhere decaying, and to the *observance of Sunday*, which was almost universally neglected by certain classes. Between the High Church party, in which personality was lost sight of and loyalty to the Church prominently put forward, and the Low Church party, in which the claims of the Church were made secondary to the claims of the individual, there arose a *third*, styled the *Broad Church Party*, whose partisans advocated more liberal or broader views of religion and Christian life.[3]

In opposition at once to the apathy of the Established Church, to the Catholic tendencies of the Puseyite movement, and to the indifference to any religion whatever prevalent among the bulk of the people, an association called the *Evangelical Alliance* was formed in 1845, which, ignoring altogether the idea of a definite Church, professes to be based on the broad principles of Christianity, a creed which has at least the merit of elasticity, and may embrace anything or nothing.[4]

---

[1] *Reuss*, Hist. of the N. T. Scriptures, 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864; Theological Science among the French Protestants (Theological Studies and Criticisms, 1844, No. 1.)

[2] See § 417, p. 265 sq.

[3] Cf. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 904-910. Dr. *Arnold*, Master of Rugby from 1828 to 1842, the year of his death, is generally credited with being the founder of this party, and Heve, Whately, and Maurice were among its ablest representatives. (Tr.)

[4] Dr. *Brownson*, speaking of the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance held in New York, in October, 1873, says: "The Protestantism represented by it is, as a power in society, a thing of the past, and has no significance for the present. It is neither frankly infidel nor frankly Christian, but strives to be a little of both. It has no principle of its own, but borrows infidel principles when it would fight against the Church, and Church principles when it would fight infidelity. The Alliance claims to be Christian, and its

Puseyism has rendered an important service to *theological science* by reviving patristic studies and stimulating that spirit of deep research which is so prominent in the English character, and which has led to the discovery of the important ecclesiastical documents published by the famous Orientalist, *Cureton* (b. 1808, d. 1864).[1] It also created a taste for *exegetics*, and in particular for Christian *apologetics* or evidences. While most of the writers at this time remained within the traditional bounds of Anglican theology, there were some who went a long way beyond them, and the *Essays and Reviews*, which were the maturest and fullest expression of such men, produced a profound sensation when they appeared in 1860. To the great scandal of the Church of England, it was soon learned that among the authors of this work some were Anglican dignitaries.[2] In the first *Essay*, on "*The Education of the World*," the divine interposition in human affairs is denied, and it is maintained that the present religious condition of mankind is the result of natural development;[3] in the *second*, the authenticity of the Bible and the verity of its prophecies are denied; in the *third*, it is attempted to prove that it is unreasonable to believe God ever wrought miracles or created the world, and, as a consequence, that creation and miracles afford no evidence of the existence of a Divine Being; in the *fourth*, it is maintained that the Scriptural characteristics of Jesus belong, not to an historical, but to an ideal personage; that the Annunciation is likewise ideal, &c.; in the *fifth*, the Book of Genesis is said to have been written by some Hebrew scientist, who, not being guided by modern geological researches, blundered egregiously; in the *sixth*, on "The Tendencies of Religious Thought in England from 1688 to 1750," there is little remarkable, except what it derives from its questionable company; in the *seventh*, on the "Interpretation of Scripture" inspiration is denied, and an effort made to adapt Scriptures to the theories set forth in the preceding essays. The doctrines contained in this work were condemned as "pernicious," and their tendencies as "heretical," by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in July, 1864. Two of its authors were condemned by the Court of Arches and suspended for a year from their benefices in 1862; but the judgment was reversed by the Crown in Council on the 8th of February, 1864, when it was judicially stated that "on the design and general tendency" of the *Essays and Reviews*, the Committee "neither *can* nor *do* pronounce any opinion."[4] Dr. *Colenso*, Bishop of Natal, in South-eastern Africa, who, having adopted the principles of modern rationalistic criticism, published, in 1862, his work, entitled "The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically Examined," denying these to be records of even "historical truth," was requested by all the Anglican bishops of England and Ireland, except three, to resign his see, which refusing to do, he was tried by a provincial synod at Cape Town, and formally deposed by his Metropolitan, November 27, 1863, but the decision was subsequently reversed by the

---

aim seems to be to wage a relentless war against Catholicity on the right and rationalism on the left; but, unhappily for it, it has no base for its operations against either, and is unable to conduct its war on any scientific principles, taken either from reason or revelation. When it attacks rationalism, it exposes itself to the merciless attacks of Catholics in flank; and when it turns against Catholics it exposes itself to the equally merciless attacks of the rationalists in the rear." *Quart. Review*, January, 1874. (Tr.)

[1] Corpus Ignatianum, London, 1849; Spicilegium Syriacum, London, 1855; Athanasii epist. festales, London, 1848; Hist. eccl. Johannis episcopi Ephes., Oxford, 1853.

[2] The *Essays and Reviews* were seven in number, the productions of as many writers, and published in February, 1860, under the editorial supervision of Prof. *Jowett*. The first Essay was by Dr. *Temple*, then Master of Rugby School; the second by Dr. *Rowland Williams*, Vice-Principal of Lampeter, a Welsh College; the third by Mr. *Baden Powell*, Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford; the fourth by the Rev. *H. B. Wilson*, Vicar of Great Stoughton; the fifth by Mr. *C. Goodwin*, a layman; the sixth by the Rev. *Mark Pattison*, then fellow and afterwards Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford; and the last by the editor, Mr. *Jowett*, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford. (Tr.)

[3] This is only a plagiarism of *Lessing's* Essay on the same subject. (Tr.)

[4] See *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, &c., art. "Broad Church;" also Cardinal *Manning*, England and Christendom, London, 1867, pp. 3-79. We have spoken in detail of the *Essays and Reviews*, not because they possess any intrinsic value, but because they are historical and mark an epoch, being the most notorious, if not the best, production of a very indifferent school. *Andreas Wagner*, Professor of Natural Sciences at the University of Munich, to whom they were handed by the editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (Vorwort, 1862) to determine their scientific value, returned them with the remark that "the book was beneath all criticism." (Tr.)

Crown in Council, on the ground that "the Bishop of Cape Town has no jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal."[1]

Ever since the union of *Scotland* with England, in 1707, the *Constitution of the True Kirk* has been a prominent subject of discussion, one of the more vital questions being whether the right of nominating ministers to parishes resides in the congregations or in the landed proprietors, who claim the right of patronage in the Reformed Church of that country.

Although the rights and privileges of the Church of Scotland had been explicitly recognized at various times by the English Government, and expressly guaranteed by William and Mary in 1688, and again by the Act of Union in 1707, still, in 1712, an act was passed by the British Parliament restoring the right of patronage in Scotland. This act gave rise to many and violent dissensions in the Kirk, and was the occasion of numerous separations from it, which have been perpetuated down to the present day. But notwithstanding that the right of patronage was enforced for above a century, there was as yet no direct invasion of ecclesiastical authority by the civil courts or the civil power, the right of presentation being regarded as only a civil prerogative, entitling the appointee, who received ecclesiastical recognition from the authorities of the Kirk, to the benefice and its emoluments. Moreover, in the exercise of the right of patronage, care was taken to observe the ancient custom of having the "*call*" *made by the parishioners*, though it was at best only an empty form.

In these latter days, when the Church of Scotland, like those of other countries, has sprung into vigorous life, the old Puritanic leaven has permeated the masses and once more aroused the old spirit of independence. The question of patronage began to be again agitated, and an *Anti-Patronage Society* was founded, in 1825, by Dr. *Andrew Thompson*, a leading minister of Edinburgh. But the contest was not formally inaugurated until 1833, when Dr. *Thomas Chalmers*, a minister of Glasgow, proposed to the General Assembly of that year a Veto Act, providing that any presentation should be set aside if opposed by one-half of the male heads of families, with or without specific reason, if they were communicants. The proposition was rejected, but one of equivalent import presented and carried in the following year against the *Moderates*, who were gradually losing ground. The case of Mr. *Robert Young*, who was rejected by a large majority of qualified heads of families, was made a test case, and, after having been carried from one court to another, was finally decided in the English House of Lords against the *Non-Intrusionists*, and the Veto declared illegal. Finally, the General Assembly agreed to the presentation of a bill in Parliament providing that, unless it were proved that the opposition to the presentee proceeded from factious and unreasonable prejudice, the instructions of the Veto should be carried out; but this was thrown out on technical grounds in 1842. The Non-Intrusionists sent a Petition of Right, embodying their claims, to Parliament in 1843, and when they learned that it had been rejected in the House of Commons, they met in General Assembly on the 18th of May of the same year, and after protesting against the action of Parliament, headed by Dr. *Welsh*, the Moderator, and Dr. Chalmers, 451 of them formally seceded from the Establishment, and organized the General Assembly of the Free Kirk of Scotland. The old spirit of the Covenanters once more swept over the country, and it was not long until every parish had its Free Kirk and Manse, and a "Sustentation Fund" was rapidly raised, which in 1874 yielded £150 to each of 775 ministers, not including the special collections of the congregations. There were, in 1874, 920 congregations and 597 schools in Scotland belonging to the Free Kirk, and a number of affiliated congregations in England, Ireland, and the United States, and in Canada and other colonies of England. Colleges for educating ministers were also founded at Edinburg, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. Much of the asperity which at first existed between the Free Kirk and the Established Church of Scotland has already disappeared.[2] The great *schism* in the Church of Scotland gave occasion to others of lesser importance, the chief of which was that of the *Irvingites*, who believe in a renewal of the prophetic and apostolic offices, and call themselves the "Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The peculiar characteristics of Protestantism in the *United States* of North America are mainly due to the varied nationalities from which its population has been recruited and to the principle of complete *separation of Church and State*, which is rigorously carried out, the various religious congregations being regarded by the Government as

---

[1] *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, &c. (Tr.) Cf. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 910-915.

[2] *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, &c., art. "Free Kirk of Scotland." (Tr.)

merely civil corporations. Notwithstanding that no formal recognition of any Church exists, Christianity is tacitly recognized as part of the Common Law; the observance of the Lord's Day is stringently enforced; and public prayers are daily offered up in legislative bodies while in session.[1] There is no discrimination between truth and error, and all opinions and creeds may be freely held and propagated, whether in private or public, provided only the rights of others are not invaded or morality openly outraged. There exists there, side by side, every form of religious belief, ancient and modern, and new sects are daily multiplying. There are to be found pietists and illuminati, and the superstitious votaries of the fooleries of turning-tables, spirit-rappings, spirit-mediums, and planchettes, in which, strange to say, these people, so boastful of their superior enlightenment, place implicit reliance. Still Christianity is making extraordinary progress, and promises to be eventually completely triumphant.

These multitudinous sects, owing to their feverish, unstable, and evanescent existence, have not gained any notable distinction in the fields of literature and science, or produced any works of eminent merit. There hardly exists a necessity to impel their members to devote themselves to the learned pursuits, inasmuch as they are supplied from England and Scotland, but notably from Germany, with works sufficiently varied to suit the needs of minds the most divergent. *Schaff*, a disciple of Neander's, and at first a professor at Mercersburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, and afterwards in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and *Nevin*, an equally eminent scholar, have been quite successful in their efforts to diffuse Protestant theology among both the English-speaking and German Protestants of the United States.[2] The political institutions and commercial conditions of the country have had a marked influence upon the religious character of the people, particularly outside the Catholic Church. The absence of the principle of conservatism in politics has contributed, probably more than is generally supposed, to the multiplication of sects with slight denominational differences, and the commercial energy of the people has given a feverish, though spasmodic activity to religious enterprises. One would be led antecedently to expect that the American system of secular education would make those who have been brought up under its influences indifferent to the distinctively doctrinal teachings of the various sects, and such is in matter of fact the case. The number of Americans who pay any attention to doctrinal differences is, as compared with the entire population, remarkably small; and it is not too much to say that positive faith, as a substantive and definite reality, is rapidly fading from the minds of the great bulk of the non-Catholic citizens. Those of them who profess to be religious at all, do so on moral rather than dogmatic grounds, or, in other words, act from merely human rather than divine motives. They do not believe in the subjection of the intellect to any constituted magisterial authority in matters of faith, and, as a consequence, they have no sanction for their conduct higher than a vague conception of the existence of God, the Divinity of Christ, and the necessity of a moral law. Their charities, too, which are probably as numerous and abundant as in any other country of the world except France, are inspired, not by a religious conviction of the necessity of giving alms and ministering to the poor and the outcast, but by the generous promptings and benevolent feelings which are so prominent in the American character. We do not say that belief in the Divinity of Christ does not exist, and is not put forward by religious organizations outside the Catholic Church, but we do say that the Incarnation, together with the distinctive doctrines flowing from it and connected with it, or, in other words, the scheme of man's redemption as a whole and in detail, is not understood by the bulk of the American people, and has no firm hold on their minds. In fact, the non-Catholics below a certain degree in the social scale rarely enter a church at all, and when they do they are impelled by other than supernatural motives. Of the churches that still continue to teach a definite creed, in as far as merely human authority can be said to be an exponent of divine truth, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Baptist have been the most successful; and it must be said that they have contributed not a little to revive religious feeling of the hazy, indefinite kind we have described. Religious revivals

---

[1] Constitutions of several States and of the U S., &c, New York, 8vo. *J. Story*, Exposition of the Const. of the U. S., N. York, 1847 *M. McKinney*, Amer. Magistrate, Philad., 1850, pp. 689, 193, 203. *G. T. Curtis*, Hist. of the Const. of the U. S., New York, 1854, 2 vols.

[2] Cfr. *Dorner*, in L. c., pp. 915-918, and *Schaff*, "America," or the Political, Social, and Ecclesiastico-Religious Condition of the United States, especially in reference to the Germans. Berlin, 1864.

are frequent, and their efforts are temporarily violent, but, like all abnormal agencies, produce no permanent result for good. There are also numerous Protestant seminaries, religious periodicals and newspapers, and vast societies for removing social evils and evangelizing the poor, both at home and abroad, but all these enterprises labour under the same radical defect. They have no supernatural sanction, because they are not the outgrowth of a body of positive teaching, which, coming from God, must be as absolutely one and unchangeable as is the God of truth Himself.

§ 432. *Enumeration of Sects, Ancient and Modern.*

I. The *Baptists* or *Rebaptizers*, so numerous in England and the United States, were introduced into Germany, in 1834, through the preaching of the American missionary, *Oncken*.[1] After remaining for a time in Hamburg, he visited nearly every portion of Germany and Denmark, and made a small number of converts to his teaching in Prussia, Würtemberg, and the smaller German States, and in Switzerland. This pietistical sect rejected the authority of Protestant synods and the Evangelical Alliance quite as courageously as the sectaries of the same name had that of Luther and Melanchthon.

II. Like the Anabaptists, the sect of *Rationalistic Unitarians*, who deny the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, has been revived in these latter days, and has numerous adherents, both in England and the United States. The chief apostle in the latter country of this repulsive rationalism was Mr. *Channing* of Boston, whose disciples are also known as Universalists.

III. The *Moravian Brethren* and the *Methodists*, though widely separated as regards doctrine, have both laboured with disinterested zeal to revive and stimulate religious life in Europe and America.

IV. Extreme *pietism* appeared under a novel and remarkable form in Würtemberg. In 1818, *Hoffmann*, burgomaster and notary of Leonberg, obtained a licence from the Government to form a religious society at *Kornthal* on the model of the communities of the apostolic age. Its members, fully persuaded that *the convulsions and confusion which shall precede the final coming of Christ* were already taking place, set themselves to appease as best they could the anger of God. By *Bengel*, a learned exegetical writer of Würtemberg, the year 1836 was assigned as the date of the end of the world. *Christopher Hoffmann*, inspector of the Evangelical school near Ludwigsburg, who had been successful over David Strauss[2] for a seat in the Frankfort Parliament, following in the footsteps of his father, and despairing of the political and ecclesiastical condition of Europe, founded in the Hardthof, near Marburg, in 1853, a provisional home for the elect of God, where they were to await their translation to *Palestine*, there to resume the life of true Christians, after the model foreshadowed by the prophets.

At *Wildenspuch*, in the Canton of Zürich, the pietistic infatuation was carried to an incredible excess. *Margaret Peter*, an unmarried woman and the daughter of a farmer, by association with men calling themselves the "*Revived*," and by the reading of works on mysticism, wrought herself up to such a pitch of excitement that she believed, or professed to believe, that events of extraordinary religious import were shortly to take place. This conviction stimulated her activity for the salvation of herself and those about her. Although a notorious adulteress, she exerted a powerful influence in the religious assemblies of the "Revived." Stricken with remorse of conscience and the victim of wounded spiritual pride, she lacerated her body most cruelly, stating that she did so "by command of God." For the purpose, as she pretended, of gaining allies to confound the devil and of making an acceptable offering to Christ, she, on the 15th of March, 1823, had her brother and others scourged unto the shedding of blood, after which she killed her sister Elizabeth with a club, and finally had herself put to death by crucifixion. She had predicted that she would rise again on the third day, but failed to make good her promise.[3]

Similar exhibitions of devotion, mortification, and lust took place in the pietistical

---

[1] *John Gerard Oncken* was born at Varel, Oldenburg, about 1800. He was first a servant and subsequently a book-agent for the Edinburgh Bible Society, and afterwards became a missionary. Cf. *Jörg*, Hist. of Protestantism, Vol. II., p. 16 sq.

[2] *Jörg*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 203-280.

[3] *L. Meyer*, The Frightful Scenes at Wildenspuch, 2nd ed., Zürich, 1824. *Jarcke*, The Frightful Scenes at Wildenspuch (Miscellanea), Munich, 1839.

conventicles of *East Prussia* and the *Wupperthal*. A Mr. *Stephan*, pastor of a congregation of Bohemians in Dresden, after having induced a large number of persons to embrace a species of Lutheran Pietism, and been active in encouraging others to emigrate to America, was arrested, brought before the courts, and convicted of having seduced many married and single women.

Akin to this utter prostitution of religion to base purposes is the profession of the *Mormons*, or, as they prefer to call themselves, The Free Church of Jesus Christ of *Latter-Day Saints*, founded, in 1827, in North America, by *Joseph Smith*.[1] Born in the year 1805, in the State of Vermont, of disreputable parents, Smith, from his earliest years, was a visionary, and as he grew in age continued meditative and solitary, and finally professed to have been honoured with angelic visits. On the 22nd of September, 1827, after passing through a certain disciplinary preparation, he received from the hands of his angelic visitants wonderful records, engraven on metallic plates, and containing the history of the earliest inhabitants of America. The first of these were the *Jaredites*, a wicked and bloodthirsty race from Babel, who destroyed each other in incessant wars; and the next the American Indians or the descendants of *Lehi*, a Jewish patriarch, who set out from Jerusalem during the reign of Zedekias, and, after many wanderings, made his way to America. These aboriginal tribes had been converted by our Lord in person, but subsequently losing their faith, a prophet named *Mormon* wrote out their history, traditions, religious usages, &c., and buried the record in the earth. This wonderful record, believed by the Mormons to be of equal authority with the Bible, was brought to light in 1830, but, as has been since proven, is nearly a literal transcript of a romance left in manuscript by *Solomon Spalding*, a clergyman, who died in 1816. Professing to be a prophet, Smith soon gathered about him a large number of disciples, and organized his first church at Manchester, N. Y., in 1830; but in the following year went west as far as Kirtland, O., where his followers still continued to increase. A colony went to Missouri, and established what they called the "Zion" at the town of Independence. In 1838, the Saints, to the number of 15,000, quitted Missouri, and passing over to Illinois, built there *Nauvoo*, or the City of Beauty, of which Smith, who was shot by a mob in 1844, became the supreme ruler. It was here that "celestial marriage," or polygamy, was first practised.

In 1845 the hostility of the "*Gentiles*" grew so intense and threatening that the Mormons were forced to quit Nauvoo, and passing beyond the limits of civilization, they settled on the shores of Salt Lake, in the present territory of Utah, in 1846. From this new Zion missionaries have gone forth into all quarters of the world to make converts to the Church of the Latter-Day Saints. They call their Government a *Theo-Democracy*, its organization consisting of a presidency, a patriarchate, a council of twelve, a college of seventy or the propagandists, a body of high-priests, of bishops, of elders, of priests or ministers, and of teachers and deacons or catechists, and church-collectors.

The doctrine of the Mormons, prescinding altogether from its gross and degrading materialism, is the most grotesque mass of absurd rubbish that the human mind can well conceive.

Their distinctively social institution of polygamy receives its sanction from a pretended revelation to the prophet in 1843, according to which the rank and dignity of the Saints in the world to come would be proportioned to the number of their wives and children in this. There is also among them a partial community of goods, and they have very justly been compared in many respects to the Mohammedans. The origin of the two systems rests upon a fictitious revelation, and the motives, rewards, and punishments are strikingly similar in both. The sect has been permitted to exist, because it has been until quite recently beyond the bounds of civilization, but its legal or forcible suppression is only a question of years.

V. *Edward Irving* († 1834), a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who, however, passed most of his public life in London, was the reputed founder of a very peculiar form or sectarianism. After a short and unsuccessful ministry in Scotland, he came to London

---

[1] Book of Mormon, Book of Covenants. The former work has been several times printed since 1830, even in German; tr. by *Pratt*, Eine Stimme der Warnung und Belehrung für alle Völker, from the English, Hamburg, 1853. *Turner*, Mormonism in all Ages, New York, 1843. **Jörg*, Hist. of Protest., Vol. II., pp. 444-603. *Herzog's* Cyclop., Vol. X., pp. 1-17

in 1822, and was soon recognized as the most eloquent preacher that had appeared in the metropolis for years. A close student of the Prophets, of Shakespeare and Byron, his language was naturally elevated, fervid, and energetic, and his church was thronged with the *élite* of London society. But, as time went on, his style palled upon the ears of his hearers, who deserted him in large numbers, and seeing his popularity waning, he implored the Holy Ghost with passionate earnestness to bestow upon him the gifts of the Apostles, that he might proclaim to the world in fitting terms the second personal coming of Christ, which he believed to be near at hand. In the conviction that his prayer had been heard, he began, like the Christians at Corinth, to preach discourses utterly incomprehensible to his hearers, and to fancy that he had ecstatic visions (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν. He was tried before the London presbytery on the charge of heresy, in 1830, convicted, and deprived of his charge in 1832, and in the following year deposed. The majority of his congregation, captivated by the brilliancy and eloquence of his defence, remained loyal to him, and with these originated the sect of *Irvingites*, or, as they call themselves, the *Apostolic Catholic Church*. They believe that the gift of prophecy and the apostolic gift of tongues are inherent and perpetual in the Church, which embraces the fourfold ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors or angels. The Irvingites have established themselves in England, Canada, the United States, Prussia, France, and Switzerland, especially at Geneva, but they are by no means numerous. In Germany, among the converts to this new Church of the future, were the pietist theologian, *Thiersch* of Marburg, and the two Catholic priests, *Lutz* of Oberroth in Bavaria, and *Spindler* of Augsburg.[1]

§ 433. *Protestant Missions and Bible Societies.*

Blumhardt, Magazine of the Most Recent Hist. of Evang. Missions and Bible Societies, Basle, 1816. The Annual Reports of London, Edinburgh, Basle, Halle, and Berlin, on the Success of the Bible Societies and the Progress of Evangelical Missionary Work during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Berlin, 1828. *Steger*, Protestant Missions, Hof (1838), 1844; *new series* for 1830-1841, Ibid., 1842. *Wiggers*, Hist. of Evang. Missions, Hamburg, 1845, 2 vols. Missionary Reports of the East India Missionary Institute at Halle since 1849, Halle, 1849 sq. *Kalkar*, Dew evangeliske Missions-Historie, Copenhagen, 1857. A fine and carefully elaborated geographical map, giving the Protestant Missionary Stations, by *Theophilus König*, Berlin, 1851. *American Cyclopædia*, art. "Missions, Foreign." *Grundemann*, General *Missionary Atlas*, Gotha, 1867-1871 (72 coloured maps), merits special attention. †*Wiseman*, Sterility of Missions undertaken by Protestants; Germ. transl., Augsburg, 1835; a similar judgment is passed by a *Protestant* missionary in a foreign country, 1840, nros. 119, 120, and by *Marshall* in Christian Missions.

We have already stated that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was comparatively little activity in Protestant missions.

The first great Protestant missionary society, called the "*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*," was formed in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Having been originally designed for the establishment and maintenance of colonial churches, its operations have been confined to the British colonies in the East and West Indies, Southern Africa, the Seychelles, Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. It is under the control of the Church of England.

The "Scottish Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge," founded in 1709, laboured for some years among the North American Indians, but without producing any lasting results.

From 1714 to 1845 the Danish Missions were under the direction of the *Royal Missionary College and Seminary of Copenhagen*. For the

[1] *Jörg*, Hist. of Protest., Vol. II., pp. 77-203. *Lutz*, Farewell Address to My Parish of Oberroth, Kaufbeuren, 1857. God's Work in these Latter Days, Ulm, 1857. *Jacobi*, The Doctrine of the Irvingites, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1868.

missions of East India, under the control of the same college, missionaries trained in Francke's Institute at Halle were as a rule selected; while, for those of *Greenland*, Danish Lutheran ministers were employed from the year 1721 onward. The latter, following in the footsteps of Hans Egede, succeeded in partially civilizing the inhabitants, and converted about ten thousand of them to Christianity.[1] Of the earlier evangelical missionaries, the Moravians were at once the most earnest and the most successful.[2] More recently several BRITISH AMERICAN and CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN associations have undertaken to propagate Protestantism among the heathen. The most important of these are: The *Baptist Missionary Society*, founded in 1792; the great *London Missionary Society*, founded in 1795; the *Scotch Missionary Society*, founded at Edinburg, in 1796; and the *Netherlands Missionary Society*, founded at Rotterdam, in 1797, mainly through the influence of Dr. Vanderkemp, a missionary in British pay. Of the missionary societies founded since the opening of the present century, the most efficient are the *Church Missionary Society*, in England, organized in 1799; the *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, founded at Boston, U. S., in 1810; the *Wesleyan Missionary Society*, founded at London, England, in 1817; the *Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Society*, founded in 1840; the *Church of Scotland Society*, founded in 1824; the *Free Church of Scotland Society*, founded in 1843; the *United Presbyterian Church of Scotland Society*. Among the other societies established in Great Britain and its colonies are: The Glasgow Missionary Society, in 1796; the United Secession Church's Foreign Mission, 1835; the Glasgow African Mission Society, 1837; the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society, 1841; the Reformed Presbyterian Church's Foreign Mission, 1842; the Loo Choo Naval Mission, 1843; the Patagonian Mission, 1844; the *English Presbyterian*, 1844; the Chinese Evangelization Society, 1850; and the Chinese Society for Furthering the Gospel, 1850. One of the most useful auxiliary societies at work in India is the Christian Vernacular Education Society.

In zeal for the promotion of the missions, the Continent of Europe has remained far behind England and America. The Dutch society of Rotterdam has already been mentioned. The most extensive of the missionary societies of continental Europe is that of *Basle*, preceded by the establishment of a general missionary seminary in 1815. An independent society, the Evangelical Missionary Society of Basle,

[1] In 1835 the chief missions of this association were transferred to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and in 1845, with the transfer of the last Danish possessions in India to Great Britain, the labours of the College of Missions there ceased altogether. The Greenland Missions have passed from the control of the Lutherans into the hands of the *Moravians*. (TR.)

[2] The missionary fields which they occupied in succession were the Danish West India Islands (1732), Greenland (1733), North American Indians (1734), Surinam (1735), South Africa (1736, and again in 1792), Jamaica (1754), Antigua (1756), Barbadoes (1765), Labrador (1770), St. Kitt's (1775), Tobago (1790, and again in 1827), the Mosquito coast (1848), Australia (1849), and Thibet (1853). They now count in ninety stations nearly twenty-two thousand communicants. Cf. *Amer. Cyclopæd.*, L. c. (TR.)

was founded in 1821, which now sustains missionaries in West Africa, India, and China. The Basle society at first received the missionary contributions of Protestant Germany; afterwards several other societies sprang up. Those exclusively or mainly *Lutheran* are the Berlin Missionary Society, founded in 1824, and supporting a mission in Southern Africa with thirty-one stations and forty-eight labourers; the Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Association of Leipsig, founded, in 1836, and occupying in Southern India the former missionary field of the Danes; and the Hermannsburg Society, founded, in 1854, which sends out entire missionary colonies, especially to Bechuania and Natal, in South Africa. Among those of *evangelical* tendencies are the following: The Rhenish Missionary Society, founded in 1828; Gossner's Missionary Union, founded in 1836; and the North German Missionary Society, founded in 1836, which have missions in Africa, India, China, the Indian Archipelago, and the South Sea Islands. Special associations for *China* have been formed (from 1816-1849) at Cassel, Barmen, Dresden, Halle, Berlin, and in Pomerania. The *French Reformed Church* has had a missionary society since 1822, which sustains flourishing missions among the *Bassutos* of Southern Africa, where it has now seventeen stations. Norway founded a foreign missionary seminary at Bergen, in 1859, and Denmark organized its own missionary society in June, 1860. There are now fifty-two Protestant missionary societies engaged in spreading biblical Christianity among the heathen. These societies collect and spend, in the aggregate, annually over 5,500,000 dols.

As an *aid* to the missionary societies, *Bible Societies* have been organized for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in every tongue. Nearly simultaneously with the foundation of the London Missionary Society, in 1804, the *British and Foreign Bible Society* and the *Religious Tract Society* came into existence. They are most important auxiliaries to the various missionary societies, for which they form a sort of centre of operations, and have enormous resources at their command. With no desire to detract from the good Christian missionaries have done by translating the Bible and other religious works into many languages, or from the really great contributions they have made to advance knowledge by reducing barbarous tongues to rules and preparing grammars and dictionaries of them, we cannot but regard this method of propagating Christianity as liable to many abuses, and as often retarding rather than promoting the work of conversion. First of all, the translations are frequently detestably bad; next, the reading of the *Bible without note* or *comment* is hardly a proper method for a heathen to acquire his first knowledge of Christianity, when Christians themselves, with antecedent Christian traditions in their minds, notoriously disagree as to the proper interpretation to be put upon its words; and, finally, the Deutero-canonical Books are regarded by Protestants as apocryphal, and since the year 1831 have been excluded from the text of their versions. Moreover, great divergencies of opinion exist among missionaries of different sects,

which are necessarily fatal to the success of a work, requiring, if any work does, the most complete harmony of belief and unity of action in the ministers engaged in it. To preserve an *appearance* of harmony, the German Missionary Societies began, in 1846, to hold general assemblies at stated intervals, each assembly being held in a different city.

Having thus considered the different missionary organizations of the Protestant world, we will finally pass in review the principal fields of missionary labour, and see what has been accomplished.

The *Baptist Missionary Society*, immediately after its organization, sent missionaries to the north of *India*, Dr. *Carey*, its organizer, being one of its first and most efficient. *Serampore* soon became the centre of successful and extensive missionary operations. The Bible, entire or in parts, was issued from the press there in twenty-seven different versions, and numerous schools were opened. The Baptists have at present missions in Western Africa, India, China, and the West Indies, with 423 stations. Missionaries are now sent to India by many other societies, not only of Great Britain, but also of the United States and Continental Europe. The *London Missionary Society* sent its first labourers, twenty-nine carefully selected ministers, to the *South Sea Islands* in 1797, where, after twenty years of difficulty and discouragement, they began to make considerable progress in *Tahiti*, the chief of the *Society Islands*, and subsequently in the other islands also, many of which are now entirely Christian. The gentle manners of the inhabitants predispose them to Christianity and render them amenable to the influences of modern civilization.[1] In the course of time the same society sent missionaries to China, the Islands of the Indian Archipelago, Mauritius, Southern Africa, the West Indies, Guiana, North America, and also to the Island of *Madagascar*, where they made considerable conquests, mainly through the enlightened liberality of King *Radama I.* (fr. 1810), who received them kindly and took them under his protection. They also obtained permission from the king to open schools and set up a printing-press at *Antananarivo*, the central town and capital of the whole island of Madagascar. The persecution waged by Queen *Ranavalona* (fr. 1828 to 1861), to which over 2,000 Christians fell victims, whilst others hid away in woods, could not extinguish Christianity in her dominions. The hopes inspired by the accession of *Radama II.*, in 1861, were abruptly terminated by the death of that prince, who perished in a popular tumult two years later. His successor, Queen *Rosaherina*, in a treaty concluded with England, secured liberty of conscience to Christians. The Island of *Mauritius*, which became a dependency of England in 1810, was visited by ministers of the London Missionary Society, in 1814, and in 1852 created an Anglican bishopric. The Protestant missions on the Island of Madagascar are directed by authorities resident here, while the Catholic missions on the same great island are conducted from the Island of *Réunion*. The most distinguished of the London Society's missionaries are Dr. *Robert Morrison* and *Karl*

[1] Cf. "*Ausland*," 1842, nros. 316 and 328.

Gützlaff,[1] in *China*, and Drs. *Moffat* and *Livingstone*,[2] in Africa. The Anglican *Church Missionary Society* selected as its first missionary field Western Africa. As no volunteers could be found in England for this arduous mission, the society commenced its operations with the pupils of *Jänicke's Missionary Institute*, in Berlin. Fifteen German missionaries tried (from 1804 to 1818) to evangelize the *Rio Pongas*, but their efforts were baffled by the deleterious climate and the

[1] Born at Pyritz, Pomerania, in 1803, he died in Victoria, Hong Kong, July 9, 1851. A sonnet, expressive of his earnest wish to become a missionary to the heathen, which he addressed to the King of Prussia, led to his being admitted as a student into the missionary institute conducted by Jänicke, in Berlin. After two years of preparation, he obtained his first appointment from the Dutch Missionary Society at Rotterdam, which sent him to Batavia, in 1826. There he married a rich English lady, and during his two years' sojourn in Java he mastered the Chinese language. He then determined to go on his own account to China. Happening in the summer of 1828 to fall in with *Tomlin*, an English missionary stationed at Siam, he went with him to Bangkok, the capital, the aim of both being to perfect themselves in Chinese. Thence Gützlaff, in 1831, undertook a voyage to China, and Macao now became his principal station, where he formed an intimate friendship with *Robert Morrison*. In conjunction with *Medhurst* and two other friends, Gützlaff began a new translation of the Bible into Chinese. With the assistance of Morrison, he founded a society for the diffusion of useful knowledge in China, published a Chinese monthly magazine, and preached at Macao and elsewhere. After the death of Dr. Morrison, in 1834, Gützlaff was appointed chief interpreter to the British superintendency. The difficulties that had grown up between the Chinese and British had obstructed the progress of the missions. During the war he rendered the British army great services as secretary to the British plenipotentiary, and at its close, in 1842, as mediator. In 1844 he organized a society, ostensibly Chinese, for the purpose of carrying Christianity into the interior, through the medium of native agents, and in 1849 visited Europe in behalf of the project. He was finally appointed superintendent of *trade*, which office he held until his death. Gützlaff, besides his translation of Biblical works into various Asiatic languages, wrote in English, "History of the Chinese Empire," London, 1834; "China Opened," 1838; a "Journal of Three Voyages along the Coast of China" (1831-1833); and a "Life of Tao-Kuang," 1851; and in Chinese, "Pro and Contra." Among his German works are: *Allgemeine Länder-und Völkerkunde*, Ningpo, 1843; *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, Stuttgart, 1847. Cfr. *Chambers'* and *American Cyclopædias*, s. v. (Tr.)

[2] *David Livingstone*, Scotch Presbyterian by birth, carried away by religious enthusiasm for missionary life, studied theology and medicine at Glasgow, and offered his services to the London Society as a missionary to Africa, whither he went in 1840. At Natal he made the acquaintance of a fellow-missionary, *Robert Moffat*, whose daughter he afterwards married. Soon he proceeded inland to the mission station *Kuruman*, in Bechuania, where he laboured till 1849, when he made his first journey in search of *Lake Ngami*, which he discovered on the 1st of August. From 1852-1856 he traversed South Africa from the Cape of Good Hope, by Lake Ngami, to Linyanti; thence to the western coast in lat. 10° S.; then returned to Linyanti; and, after passing through Tete, descended the *Zambesi* to the sea, passing over an estimated distance of 11,000 miles. In 1857 he published in England his first book, entitled "Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa." In 1858 he returned to Africa; went to *Quilimane*, at the mouth of the Zambesi river; and at first travelled N.W., following up the Zambesi river. He then diverged to the north, exploring *Lake Nyassa*, which he discovered in 1859, and afterwards explored the country W. and N.W. for a distance of about 300 miles. In 1864, Livingstone returned to England, and next year published "Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries." He immediately set out on another expedition, and nothing was heard of him for years. Finally, the "New York Herald" dispatched Mr. *Stanley*, one of its correspondents, in search of the missing traveller. Mr. Stanley found Livingstone, in the autumn of 1871, at Ujiji, alive and well. Livingstone and Stanley together now made a journey to the north end of *Lake Tanganyika*, and were led to conclude that the lake had no communication with the Nile. Mr. Stanley left Livingstone at Unyamyembe, in March, 1872, and returned to England. Livingstone afterwards reached Lake Bangweolo, near which he died of dysentery, May 4, 1873. (Tr.)

intrigues of the slave-traders; yet, after 1818, missionary labours were attended with success in *Sierra Leone*. The Church Society erected stations in India, New Zealand, in Rupert's Land around Hudson's Bay, in the West Indies, in China, in Abyssinia, and on the banks of the Niger. In Eastern India an Anglican see was established at *Calcutta* in 1815, and three suffragan sees at *Bombay* and *Madras* in 1833; and finally at *Colombo*, in the island of Ceylon. Much of the success of the missions there is due to the labours of Bishops *Heber* († 1826) and *Wilson*, the latter of whom had all distinction of caste abolished among Christian Hindoos. Still Christianity, though professed by some of the most gifted of the natives, such as the famous Rammohun-Roy, is not making many conquests. After fifty years of labour, all the Protestant denominations, according to the statistical tables of Dr. Mullen, counted, in 1862, but 153,000 Christians in India.

The *American Board*, like the London Society, undenominational, but mainly representing the Congregationalists and some of the Presbyterian churches, at present has missions in India, China, Japan, South Africa, Turkey, the *Hawaiian* or Sandwich Islands, the Micronesian Islands, and among the North American Indians. It has been remarkably successful in the Hawaiian Islands (from 1819), the number of members in its churches reaching at one time more than 22,000; the present number is 12,360. Many of the *Society* and *Sandwich Islands* have embraced Methodism. In recent times, *Methodists* have laboured earnestly to convert the inhabitants of the *Fiji* or *Viti Islands*, and in 1857 there were said to be 54,281 attending the service of Wesleyan missionaries.[1] The Methodists have been moderately successful in the kingdom of *Ashantee*, in Africa, and also on the south-east coast.

In North America, the *Methodists* and *Baptists* are only partially successful in their efforts to gain converts, though the German *Lutherans* make considerable progress.

According to the latest statistical reports, Protestant missionary societies support about 5,000 missionaries, scattered in 1,580 different parts of the globe. Without any central authority or common principle of union, representing numerous societies that have no connection with each other, and destitute of the spirit of self-sacrifice which characterizes the true Catholic priest,[2] they have nothing that at all resembles the splendid and elaborate organization of the Catholic missions. But, with all its defects and shortcomings, the missionary zeal displayed in the present and preceding centuries by Protestantism is one of its most attractive and redeeming features.[3]

[1] Cf. *Williams* and *Calvert's* Fiji and the Fijians, 2 vols., London, 1858.

[2] The Anglican Church Missionary Society pays every missioner an annual salary of 6,000 francs, 1,000 for his wife, and 500 for every infant child. According to *Rheinwald's* Ecclesiastical Gazette (Berlin, 1840, nro. 68), the expenses for the Protestant missions were *then* rated at 14,000,000 francs. The Catholic Mission Society, the only one yet in existence in the Church, spent, in 1839, only the *ninth* part of that sum.

[3] The Protestants have missionary training schools established at *Gosport* (near Ports-

It is worthy of remark that the rationalists look with disfavour upon all missionary work, because the missionaries are engaged in propagating teachings which in their eyes have no value. Rationalism being of its very nature barren and destitute of every vital principle, has never yet either inspired or produced a great and noble work; and its votaries have never had sufficient faith in their own professions to go forth and preach them in distant lands or to send others to do so.

The Lutherans of Bavaria showed a similar spirit in designating contributions to the Nürnberg Missionary Society, the wages of sin; but in 1852, when the society passed wholly under Lutheran influence, their opinion underwent a remarkable change.

§ 434. *Catholics and Protestants and their Relations to each other.*

Cf. *Historico-Political* Papers, Vol. I., pp. 31-47.

During that predominantly rationalistic period immediately preceding and immediately following the French Revolution, there was a lull in polemic strife between Catholics and Protestants. *Religious indifference*[1] everywhere prevailed; and while some professed Deism and others Atheism, in neither party was religious conviction sufficiently strong or religious feeling sufficiently intense to give occasion to polemic controversy. People had ceased to give any attention to the points of difference that distinguished one creed from another; and, as for the Catholic Church and her institutions, those who made a boast of their superior culture and enlightenment no longer thought it worth while to take any notice of them. If anyone desirous of literary notoriety made an assault upon the Church, he did so from a political rather than a dogmatic point of view; or he attacked some particular institution, such as the Society of Jesus, which had been long an object of hatred to parties the most divergent outside the Catholic body.

Planck,[2] already far advanced in years, having had neither share in nor sympathy with the revolutionary movements that convulsed his age, very justly reproached Protestants with their ignorance of Catholicism, telling them with commendable frankness, that their knowledge of it was little better than a travesty of the truth, and that in studying it they did not take pains to inform themselves by consulting Catholic works and examining Catholic symbols, the only authoritative doctrinal expositions of Catholic faith, but, on the

mouth), in England (1801); at *Andover* and *Princeton*, in America; at *Berkel*, *Rotterdam* (1810); *Basle* (1815); *Edinburgh* (1820); *Calcutta* (1821); *Paris* (1824); *London* (1825); *Barmen* (1829); *Berlin* (1825).

[1] Cfr. *Gengler*, Catholicity and Protestantism, or Indulging a Hope of their Lapsing into Indifferentism (*Tübingen Quarterly Review*, 1832, p. 203 sq.) See also Reflections on Indifference, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., p. 751 sq.

[2] *Planck*, Outlines of a Hist. and Comparative Exposition of Dogmatical Systems, 3rd ed., Goettingen, 1822, pp. 77-83. Cfr. *Brenner*, The Ignorance and Dishonesty of Lutheran Divines Unmasked, 2nd ed. Bamberg, 1830.

contrary, clung to the old traditionary lies, and when seeking information on the teachings of the Catholic Church, did so in the works of hostile writers, by whom they were misrepresented. The reproof administered by Planck and *Marheineke* to the Protestants of their day are quite as applicable to the Protestants of our own Catholic doctrine is as persistently misrepresented and falsified now as then in Protestant catechisms and religious works; among others, in the *Catechism of the Synod of Duisburg*, published in 1843, with a view to give the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants;[1] and Protestant faculties of theology, in reporting upon the case of Bruno Bauer, carried their "*evangelical zeal*" to the length of confounding Catholicity with Deism and Naturalism.[2] Professor *Harless* of Erlangen, a leading Protestant, had the indecency to publish in the *Protestant Journal* (July, 1843, pp. 77-86), of which he was the editor, that the Catholic Church is the whore of Babylon, and that Popery was introduced into Hayti amid bloodshed and licentiousness. "Let us therefore pray," he added, "that the Lord may be pleased to destroy with the breath of his mouth this corrupting and soul-destroying institution."

Religious controversy between Catholics and Protestants once more ceased almost everywhere during the continuance of the Napoleonic Empire, when the whole German people rose up as a single man, resolved never to sheathe the sword until they had rid their country of the presence of a foreign oppressor; and, again, at the time of the Congress of Vienna, when to become a united people was the one idea that dominated the nations of Germany, a similar absence of controversial rancour was noticeable. But the calm was more apparent than real; for, when the claims of Catholics were brought before the Congress, the treatment they received was a presage of the hostility to the Church displayed at a later day; and, notwithstanding that Catholic princes had united with Protestant princes to form the *Germanic Confederation*, and in spite of the fact that all denominations were secured equal rights by Article XVI. of the Federal Act,[3] Catholics were treated with unjust discrimination, and their expostulations, when made, evaded by the *Diet*, on the ground that it was incompetent to deal with such questions.[4]

[1] Cf. "Veracity and Impartiality of Protestant Text-books," in *The Catholic*, August, 1841, Supplement. The Catholic Clergy of Crefeld opposed to the Duisburg Catechism, a Catechism on the Differential Doctrines, Crefeld, 1844. *Examination* of the Duisburg Catechism by a Catholic Divine, Düsseldorf, 1844. *Truth and its Travesty*, or the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, opposed to the Defence of the Duisburg Catechism, by *H. J. Graeber;* reviewed by Dr. *Henry Rütjes*, 2nd ed., Emmerich, 1845. *Baltzer*, The Christian Dogma of Eternal Beatitude, Mentz, 1844. *Idem*, Theological Letters, Mentz, 1844; 2nd series, Breslau, 1845.

[2] Opinion of the Prussian Faculties of Protestant Theology on the Licentiate, Bruno Bauer, Berlin, 1842; a sharp reply thereto in *Bruno Bauer's* pamphlet, entitled "The Good Cause of Liberty and My Own Affairs," Zurich, 1843. Criticisms from a *Catholic* point of view, in the *Tübing. Quart. Review* of 1842, p. 163 sq.; and in *The Catholic* of 1844, Sept. nro., pp. 115-117.

[3] *Article XVI.* reads as follows: "Difference of religion shall not make any difference in the enjoyment of civil and political rights throughout the Germanic Confederation."

[4] On the affair of *Kettenburg*, see "*The Catholic*," June, 1853. See also above, at page 288, note, the writings "On Parity in Prussia."

The celebration of the ter-centennial jubilee of the Reformation, in 1817, and the offensive bearing of Protestants towards Catholics, which it very naturally inspired and fostered, revived the polemical spirit of a former age, and while preachers from their pulpits denounced the Church with vehement bitterness, ultra-Protestant writers assailed her, if possible, still more fiercely through the press. This outburst of religious animosity became general, and acquired a sort of historical importance, from the fact that it impressed upon Catholics a sense of their political rights, strengthened their faith, and intensified their loyalty to the Church. In Saxony, where there exists a perverse disposition to prevent a reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics, the occasion was eagerly seized to create a feeling against the latter on political grounds,[1] a mode of misrepresentation against which an energetic declaration was made by the bishops of England at this very time (1826).[2] The same dishonest tactics were resorted to after the disastrous and fratricidal war of 1866, and again with intensified virulence after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 and 1871. On the former occasion the Supreme Protestant Consistory of Baden was seriously compromised; and on the latter the Catholic clergy of Prussia, than whom there is not a more loyal body of men in the Empire, and notably the *Jesuits and other religious orders* of both sexes, and even the *bishops*, were subjected, under the Falk laws of May 11, 1873, to deprivation, fines, imprisonment, and exile. These laws, ostensibly enacted to protect the rights of the State, have obviously no excuse for their existence other than that of paralyzing the energies and extinguishing the life of the Catholic Church. In vain did a far-seeing Swiss tell the Germans, on a solemn occasion at Frankfort, in 1862, "to cease their religious conflicts, because," said he, "*they are the death of Protestantism, and will render abortive all your efforts at union.*"

The most violent personal attack which these religious controversies called forth was that made by *John Henry Voss*,[3] a German scholar, on *Stolberg*,[4] his former friend, a circumstance which rendered the offence unpardonable, and for no reason other than that the latter saw fit to exercise the Protestant prerogative of private judgment and become a Catholic. The indignant rejoinders of Catholic writers were of a character to fire the courage of the most listless and apathetic of their co-religionists. For a time the periodical press of

1 *Tzschirner*, Protestantism and Catholicism from a Political Point of View, 4th ed., Lps., 1824. Abbot *M. Prechtl* answered it by his Examination of Tzschirner's Pamphlet, Sulzbach, 1823. Remarks of a Prussian Protestant on Tzschirner's Onslaught on the Catholic Church, Offenburg, 1824. Another Examination of Tzschirner's Pamphlet, by *William von Schütz*, 1827.

2 See § 403, p. 184 sq.

3 *Voss*, How did Fred. Stolberg become a Slave? Sophronizon, 1819, Vol. III. Correspondence between H. Voss and Jean Paul.

4 *Stolberg*, Reply to the Libel of Aulic Councillor Voss, Hamburg, 1820. Cfr. Stolberg and Dr. Paulus of Heidelberg (by *Fr. Geiger*), Mentz, 1820. Stolberg and Sophronizon, or The Good Faith of Doctor Paulus, Mentz, 1821. *Hasert*, Was I the Devil's Imp when I turned Catholic? Bunzlau, 1854.

Germany introduced offensive personalities into polemical discussions, and converts to Catholicity were made objects of satire and ridicule in romances written expressly for the purpose;[1] but as the treatment of so momentous a subject in so flippant a manner was out of harmony with the staid gravity of the German character, it received scant encouragement, and was finally abandoned. Polemics then assumed a purely scientific character, and this date marks the opening of the controversy on *Symbolism*, or the historical exposition of the various religious systems and formularies of faith. *Marheineke*[2] assures us that his chief object in publishing his Symbolism was to correct "the deep-seated and deplorable ignorance, not only of Protestant laymen, but also of certain theologians and canonists, concerning Catholic teaching, which was most absurdly misrepresented." But, in spite of the best intentions, Marheineke fell into the very fault which he so severely rebuked in others, misstating many points of Catholic doctrine. The writings of *Winer*,[3] *Guericke*, *Marsh*, *Planck*, *Koellner*, *Thiersch*, and in a measure those of *Boehmer*, are marred by the same blemish, though not to the same degree. To the surprise of everyone, *Charles Hase* went out of his way in his *Polemics*, a work of little value, to revive the old quarrels and stir up fresh hatred between Catholics and Protestants; but having done so, he had no right to complain of the acrimonious tone of the replies which so unprovoked an assault called forth.[4]

After remaining for a long time on the defensive,[5] Catholics assumed an emphatically aggressive attitude, which culminated in *Moehler's* splendid work on Symbolism, the decisive influence of which on theological science and the development of Catholicity has been already described. Much against the author's will, he was forced in his controversy with his adversaries to abandon the pacific and

[1] *Bretschneider*, Henry and Antonio. The author of a pamphlet entitled "Baron von Sandau Reinstated in the Tribunal of Sound Criticism," Lps., 1839, p. 105, justly observes "*that works of such a character will pervert the judgment of indifferent thinkers and scholars for half a century.*"

[2] *Planck*, Outlines of a Historical and Comparative Exposition of the Dogmatical Systems, 3rd ed., Goettingen, 1822. *Marheincke*, System of Catholicism, or Comparative Exposition of Doctrine (or Symbolism), III. Pts., Heidelberg, 1810-1814.

[3] *Winer*, Comparative Exposition of the Doctrine of Different Christian Denominations, Lps., 1824. *Klausen*, Constitutions and Rites of Catholicism and Protestantism; transl. fr. the Danish into German, 2 vols., Neustadt, 1828. *Guericke*, General Christian Symbolism, Lps., 1839. *Marsh*, Comparative Exposition of the Anglican and Roman Churches; transl. fr. the English into Germ. by Dr. *Eisele*, Grimma, 1848. *Köllner*, Symbolism of the Christian Denominations, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1837-1844. *Thiersch*, Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism, Erlangen, 1846. *Matthes*, Comparative Symbolism of all the Christian Denominations, Lps., 1854. *Baier*, Symbolism of the Christian Denominations, Greifswalde and Lps., 1854 sq. *Böhmer*, The Differential Doctrines of the Catholic and Evangelical Churches, 2 vols., Berlin, 1857 sq.

[4] *Hase*, Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church, Lps., 1862; 2nd ed., '65; 3rd, '71. Replies in the "Episcopal Letter" of *Bishop Conrad* of Paderborn; in "*The Catholic*," 1864, Vol. I., pp. 277-310; by *Dieringer;* by *Schulte*, Man-traps for Protestants, Paderborn, 1865. Cfr. Vienna General Literary Gazette, 1865, nro. 16. *Speil*, The Doctrines of the Catholic Church in opposition to Protestant Polemics, Freiburg, 1865. From a different point of view: *Clarus*, Literary Sports, Paderborn, 1866.

[5] See p. 277.

dignified language of science, and to speak of them in terms of indignant rebuke.[1] When such was the spirit that animated both parties, it is not surprising that the "Catastrophe of Cologne" should have occasioned between Catholics and Protestants a controversy so violent that it raged furiously between even members of the same family. While, on the one hand, Protestants revived the old calumnies against the Church and her institutions,[2] and reproached Catholics themselves with being *intolerant;* Catholics, on the other, charged Protestants with having lowered the standard of religious controversy by stripping it of its scientific character and making it a pretext for revolutionary movements, and of having inspired the iniquitous enactments by which Catholics are even at the present day deprived of their rights and reduced to the condition of slaves in *Denmark*, *Sweden*,[3] and other countries, and forbidden to ring the bells on their churches in the Reformed Cantons of Zürich, Basle, &c., though no such restrictions are placed upon Calvinists in the Catholic Canton of Soleure.

At this time it was thought the Protestant King of Holland was about to break his engagement with the Countess of D'Oultremont, who was a *Catholic.* The news was hailed with joy by Protestants throughout the country, and the *Handelsblad*, one of their leading newspapers, forgetful of the tolerance of which it professed to be a champion, in commenting on it, did so in these exultant words:[4] "The king has won a victory over himself. Netherlanders rejoice, in that he has gained a triumph such as few of those heroes whose fame fills the world have achieved." In accord with this spirit of intolerance was the conduct of *Eisenlohr*, the Protestant ecclesiastical counsellor of the Catholic metropolis of Freiburg, in Baden, who, contrary to all precedent, assembled his congregation in church on the Feast of Corpus Christi, "*for the purpose*," as he announced to them from the pulpit, "*of withdrawing them from the infection of Catholic idolatry.*" Abundant examples of the same spirit might be given, but we will only advert, in passing to the bitter and unjustifiable assaults upon Mgr. *Laurent*, on the occasion of his appointment as Bishop of Hamburg; to the reckless denunciations of Queen Victoria by the Tory newspapers, because of a few trifling concessions made to the Catholics of the kingdom; to the No-Popery cry raised

[1] *Moehler*, Symbolism, &c.; see p. 608 sq. His chief opponents were Baur, Nitzsch, and Marheineke. Later on, *Hilgers* wrote Symbolical Theology, Bonn, 1841; *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, Mentz, 1843; and *Thomas Moore*, Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion, 1833.

[2] It was said that converts to Catholicity, in making their confession of faith, were obliged to heap maledictions upon their Protestant relatives, and that the bull "*In Cœna Domini*" is still read annually, both of which statements were knowingly *false*, and the former wickedly dishonest.

[3] There are some remarkable extracts from the "*Faedrelandet*," reproduced in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* of 1840, No. 34. As to Sweden, see *Cath. Eccl. Gaz.*, 1840, nos. 34, 37, and 56. Cf. *Sion*, 1841, no. 57.

[4] In the number of March 24, 1840. Cf. *Cath. Eccl. Gaz.*, by Hoenighaus, 1840, 35.

when the Catholic hierarchy was restored to England in 1850 and to Holland in 1853; to the senseless clamour against the Austrian Concordat, in 1855, and the ignorant misrepresentation of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin in the preceding year; to the dishonest tactics employed against Superintendent *Hurter*[1] by his so-called *Professional Brethren;* to the Charlestown and Philadelphia riots of 1834 and 1844;[2] to the indecent ribaldry against the Pope, the Church, and things Catholic, evoked by the Rongian comedy; to the wicked fabrication of formularies of faith and forms of recantation ascribed to Catholics; and, finally, to the systematic and tyrannous repression of freedom of conscience in Switzerland, and to the slanderous misrepresentations of everything Catholic officially enunciated at the *ecclesiastical synods* of Berlin, Wiesbaden, Bremen, Frankfort, *Stuttgart,* and other cities.

It must, however, be frankly confessed that there has been no lack of stinging words and irritating conduct on *either* side. Since it is inevitable that controversies must arise among people holding and acting upon opposite religious principles, it is eminently desirable that they should be conducted with moderation and dignity, and be allowed to disturb as little as possible the amenities of social life. In view of the determined effort everywhere being made to obscure, and, if possible, utterly destroy *the supernatural character of the Christian and every other religion, to ignore the controlling providence of God in the affairs of men and nations, and to reject the divine authority on which dogmatic verities are based,* it is but a simple and imperative duty with Catholics and such Protestants as still believe in a revelation and profess a faith to unite in defending and preserving the inestimable treasure of revealed truth. But, above all, let the younger clergy understand and take it seriously to heart that it is in a special sense their mission to demonstrate the truth and set it clearly before the minds of the people; to dwell upon the grandeur of the Church and the divine power residing in her; and to show that whenever and wherever she has been free she has been quick to discover and prompt to minister to the wants of the human family. In this way they will conciliate and attract minds now alienated from her, and contribute to soothe the asperities of polemic strife and remove the obstacles that divide Christendom outside the Catholic Church into a multitude of conflicting sects.[3] The same advice was

[1] *Hurter,* Antistes of Schaffhausen and His so-called Professional Brethren, Schaffhausen, 1840.

[2] The Philadelphia Riot, *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers,* Vol. XIII., p. 837 sq.

[3] According to the *statistical report* given in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of Vienna for the year 1853, the number of the various Christian denominations of the world are as follows: Latin Catholics, 194,500,000; Greek Catholics 4,500,000; Armenian Catholics, 200,000; Maronite Catholics, 530,000; Syrian Catholics (United Jacobites), 35,000; Chaldean Catholics (United Nestorians), 20,000; Koptic Catholics, 15,000; Syro-Chaldaic Catholics (United Thomist Christians, cf. §§ 123 and 124), 200,000; total number of *Catholics,* 200,000,000. Schismatic Greeks, 64,000,000; Schismatic Armenians, 3,000,000; Schismatic Abyssinians, 1,800,000; Schismatic Syrians, 500,000; Koptic Monophysites, 200,000; Syro-Chaldaic Thomist Christians, 100,000; Chaldaic Nestorians, 500,000;

given by *Stark*, in 1809, in his *Banquet of Theodulus*, a work written in excellent temper, with the laudable design of conciliating Christians of every profession.

There are numerous signs which go to show that the divided state of Christendom is becoming irksome to reflecting minds; and many honest Protestants, if they do not at once enter the Catholic Church,[1] are disposed to listen patiently to her claims and judge them impartially.[2] It is not surprising, therefore, that *Brenner*[3] and *Hoeninghaus*,[4] in travelling through Protestant countries, found many of the inhabitants well disposed towards the Church. It is also a promising sign to find enlightened Protestants, whether ministers or laymen, using themselves and recommending to others *Catholic* works of devotion and instruction, such as the *Following of Christ*, *Spiritual Voices of the Middle Ages*,[5] *Massillon's Charges* or Conferences on the Duties of the Clergy,[6] the *Pensées* of Pascal,[7] and the Sermons of *Berthold*, a Franciscan friar, of *John Tauler*,[8] and others. It would seem, therefore, that the conviction is steadily deepening and widening that the Catholic Church has at all times had a high and majestic conception of Christianity, and that Catholicity itself has been shamefully misrepresented by the inveterate prejudice and ignorant hostility of its adversaries, a fact to which *Ludolph von Beckedorf* has drawn public attention and dwelt upon with forcible and dignified earnestness.[9] Moreover, the more able, single-minded, and religious of Protestants

Roscolnics, embracing 30 sects, 5,000,000; total *Oriental Schismatical* and *non-Catholic Christians*, 75,100,000. Protestants are divided into 40 larger and 110 lesser parties. The Lutherans number 18,000,000; the Anglicans, 15,000,000; the so-called United Evangelicals, i. e., Lutherans and Calvinists united by the State, 12,000,000; German, Dutch, and Helvetic Calvinists, 7,000,000; Methodists, 6,000,000; Presbyterians and Calvinist Baptists, 5,000,000; and the remaining sects, 12,000,000; total *Protestant Christians*, 80,000,000, or, according to more recent reports, 89,000,000. For an accurate statistical statement concerning the Catholic Church, see The Catholic Bishoprics of the World, by *Braumers*, Bergheim, 1861; and the *Annuario Pontificio*, now called *La Gerarchia Cattolica*, published yearly at Rome. Cf. *Neher*, Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics, Ratisbon, 1865-1868, 3 vols.

[1] *Arendt* (private lecturer at the Protestant faculty of Bonn; died professor of philosophy at Louvain), Statement of the Motives of my Conversion to the Catholic Church, Spire, 1832; Hist. of Pope Leo the Great, Mentz, 1835.

[2] *Stark*, *The *Banquet of Theodulus*, or The Re-union of the Different Christian Communions, 7th ed., Frankfort, 1827; Engl. transl., Baltimore, 1868. The *Correspondence* of Theodulus, Frankfort, 1828.

[3] *Brenner*, Flashes of Light among Protestants, or New Confessions of the Truth made by its Adversaries, Bamberg, 1830.

[4] *Hoenighaus*, Result of my Travels through Protestant Territory, or Necessity of Returning to the Catholic Church, Aschaffenburg (1835), 1837.

[5] *Galle*, Spiritual Voices of the Middle Ages, Halle, 1841.

[6] *Massillon's* Charges, Eccl. Conferences and Synodal Discourses and Episcopal Mandates on the Principal Duties of the Clergy; Engl. transl. by the Rev. C. H. Boylan, in 2 vols., dedicated to Bp. John McHale, Dublin, 1825; Germ. transl., by *Reineck*, Magdeburg, 1835-1836, 2 vols.

[7] *Pascal*, Pensées sur la religion; Germ. by *Blech*, with preface by *Neander*, Berlin, 1835; several times transl. into English; the original ed. of 1670, with illustrations by Gaucherel, reprinted in 1874.

[8] Cf. Vol. III., p. 158, note 2.

[9] *L. von Beckedorf*, A Few Words of Peace and Reconciliation, 3rd ed., Ratisbon, 852.

are precisely those who, like the Prodigal Son, begin to revive the memory of the wealth of blessings their forefathers enjoyed in the Catholic Church, and to yearn for an inheritance that should be theirs. They listen to the inspiring chants of the Church, assist at her religious offices, and witness the beautiful and touching rites and customs that appeal to eye and ear and heart in the administration of Baptism, Holy Eucharist, Confirmation, Marriage, Penance, and Extreme Unction,[1] and, turning sorrowfully away, grieve that they too are not in the House of their Father. And, while in many places *pictures* and *statues* are being quietly set up in the churches, and the beautiful Catholic practice of ringing the *Angelus* at sunrise, mid-day, and sunset is being again introduced, in others the proposal to make *liturgical ceremonies*, *auricular confession*, and *extreme unction* part of divine service has given occasion to animated discussion, and at times to unseemly struggles. These innovations were attempted at Breslau and Stuttgart by the Consistorial Counsellors, *Böhmer* and *Kapp;* and in England an effort was made to restore the *Sacrament of Confirmation* and the ancient catechumenate.

We may enumerate here, and we do so with pleasure, a few of the many works in which Protestants have emulated the zeal of Catholics. These are the propagation of Christianity, the abolition of slavery, the care of the sick and the needy, and the cultivation of the various branches of Christian art. If the restoration of the cathedrals of Ratisbon, Bamberg, Spire, Cologne, Strasburg, and other cities is due to the artistic skill, enlightened taste, and splendid generosity of the Catholics, the restoration of the churches of St. Elizabeth at Marburg, of our Lady at Esslingen, and of the Cathedral of Basle, not to mention others, is due to the same qualities on the part of Protestants; while a multitude of new structures have been erected by both.

§ 435. *Conclusion.*

We have now brought to a close the work we proposed to ourselves, which was to draw with all possible fidelity an outline of the History of the Church in her foundation and the principal phases of her development; in her growth and conflicts; in her sufferings and victories; and, finally, in the triumphant maintenance of her unchangeable teachings against the ever-shifting forms of heresy.

We have seen that she was prefigured in the Old Testament; that she was established by Christ and made prolific by the blood of the martyrs; that for a time she remained in obscurity, seeking a refuge in the dwellings of private individuals and an asylum in the Catacombs, but only to come forth at a later day triumphant and glorious; that she was victorious over Rome, its idols, and its emperors; that she became the civilizer of the barbarian hordes of

[1] *Hengstenberg's* Evangelical Church Gazette, October 29, 1856. Further details, *Jörg's* Hist. of Protestantism, Vol. I., pp. 445-555.

the North and the queen and mistress of the nations, which submitted with joyful alacrity to her spiritual authority, vested in St. Peter and his successors; that she has ever been the patron of the arts and sciences and the guardian of true liberty; that she has been unceasingly in conflict with error, superstition, and every form of unbelief, and has uniformly vanquished them all, and come forth unharmed from the struggle; that when borne down with grief by the betrayal and desertion of her own children, she has been consoled and gladdened by the accession of strangers to her fold, who have rivaled her most generous sons in the loyalty of their attachment; that she has stood firm and unshaken amid the malignant persecutions which she has endured in every age and country; that every species of force and every manner of weapon have been used against her, and that she, strong in the strength of her unchangeable doctrine, her unity of constitution, and her abiding and reliant faith in the promises of God, has successfully resisted them all, and by the incomparable majesty of her institutions, the number, variety, and beneficent character of her works, and the heroic devotion of her ministers, has proven herself superior to violence and fearless of aggression; that, though not affected by the periodical changes of the times and inaccessible to them, she alone has fully comprehended the wants of successive ages, and has been alone capable of adequately supplying them; that, while rising above the intrigues, the animosities, and the struggles of social and political revolutions, she has stilled the fierce passions that they evoked and healed the rankling wounds that they inflicted; and, finally, we have seen that she has everywhere and always faithfully laboured to accomplish the work committed to her of converting the heathen and bringing all men to God by subduing all to the light and easy yoke of Jesus Christ. The numerous figures foreshadowing the promised work of man's redemption, and the long series of events, commencing with the beginnings of time and leading up to it, found their realization, perfection, and maturity in the Church, of which Jesus Christ is the Head, who, on this very account, has ever been and must ever be the *centre of the political history of the world.* The foundation of the Church marked a *new era*, the characteristics of which are legible on every page of the world's history from that day to this. In the Church all nations have sought and found freedom, peace, and order. Alike in their prosperity and in their adversity, in their pride and in their humiliation, they have been objects of her tender care and loving solicitude. She sympathizes with them in their struggles, rejoices in their victories, mourns over their disasters, and hails their regeneration with exultant gladness. The mediatrix between earth and heaven, she is the link uniting the perishable with the everlasting; and glorifying God in mankind, she prepares mankind for the fulness of glory in God through Jesus Christ.

The guide of nations and peoples, she places herself at their head, and, leading them on to the full light of the Gospel, unites them all

under the one standard of the Cross. Having subsisted from the beginning, she will continue indefectible to the end, a glorious Church, one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic, because she has been founded by the power of the Most High; has never for a moment, from the days of the Apostles to our own, been shut out from the light of God's countenance or the sweetness of his love; and has laboured ceaselessly and assiduously to sanctify the world through the abiding presence and active influence of the Holy Ghost. That she is still the Spouse of Christ and bears upon her the tokens of divinity, and that her children are as believing and obedient in this as in any former age, the circumstances attending the celebration at Rome of the eighteenth centenary of the death of St. Peter, on the 29th of June, 1867, furnish the most abundant proof; while, at the same time, they have given an impulse to faith all over the Christian world, and have pointedly rebuked the unbelief so characteristic of these latter days. And what she has done in time past, if one may trust the signs now rising above the horizon, she will do in *time to come* for the nations of the earth. Weary of their long and cheerless wanderings, they will again lift up their hearts in hope; turn with wistful gaze towards the Cross, resplendent and triumphant; and seek a remedy for the evils that threaten social and political life with dissolution in the Church of Christ, whose fondest care it has ever been to minister to the wounds of mankind with more than a mother's tenderness, and to relieve pain and suffering with the balm that oozes out of the tree of the Cross and the soothing potency of apostolic words. In *Great Britain*, in *America*, and in *France*,[1] the movement has already begun. The people of these countries are returning in throngs, like erring but now repentant children, to the bosom of their long-deserted mother; and the morning star of Christianity is once more rising over the *peoples of Islam*, whose mission in history seems to have come to an end.[2]

Blessed be our Lord Jesus Christ in and through his Church, and may He hasten the day when Catholics and Protestants, *united* in one fold and under one Shepherd, will praise and bless the *Son of God* with accordant voice, and, in the full consciousness of past shortcomings and the forgiving generosity of present joy, cry out: "We have all something to reproach ourselves with in time gone by; but now, putting all differences aside, we confess that *the Church*, the

[1] Witness the recent establishment and *endowment by private munificence* of *six free Catholic universities*, viz., of Paris, Lille, Poitiers, Lyons, Angers, and Toulouse. (Tr.)

[2] *Weil*, in his Historical and Critical Introduction to the Koran, speaks in these words of the future of the Islam: "If it be asked what will be the future of Islam, and by what means will it reach the high degree of civilization at which Europe has arrived, we think we may reply that it will follow in every respect the course already traversed by Judaism. It will separate tradition from revelation, properly so called, and establish in its Sacred Books a broad distinction between eternal verities and simple prescriptions. Its absorption with Christianity will be the more easy, from the fact that Mohammed himself assigns to Christ and the Blessed Virgin a higher rank than do even a great many Protestants. Rationalism is a necessary step in the conversion of both Jew and Moslem; but, once they have reached this point, they appreciate the necessity of a positive law, and go straight into the Catholic Church."

Immaculate Spouse of Christ, through her Infallible Head, is and has ever been and ever will be unerring in her teachings and holy in her practice. Having strayed from the right road in the past, we desire for the future to labour solely for God's honour and glory." This frank confession of faults on both sides, different indeed, in character, but faults none the less, will be succeeded by a great feast of reconciliation, and the differences of centuries will be utterly forgotten in the flood of heavenly joy that will sweep over all hearts once more united in the loving Heart of Jesus.

Already Protestants have joined in generous rivalry with Catholics in building up the twin towers of the majestic Cathedral of Cologne, where bells are destined to be hung whose peals will ring out upon the air of Germany, carrying the soothing music of their sounds into every city and hamlet, to summon the entire people, once more united, as in pre-Reformation days, to the service and the temple of the living God, and to fellowship with the great Catholic family.[1]

But, alas! there are still many nations nearly, if not wholly, estranged from Christianity, which can enter the kingdom of God only through great tribulation.[2] Even in Europe the now dominant Liberals and Freemasons have entered upon a malignant and systematic persecution of the Church, have set themselves to the diabolical work of destroying all positive faith, and have caused laws to be enacted by which priests are subjected for imaginary offences to heavy fines, imprisonment, and exile; Religious Orders expelled; and other measures equally iniquitous carried out under pretence of providing for the well-being of the State. These persecutions, however, will serve to purify the Church, to renew her strength, and give her fresh beauty. Let hatred be as satanic as it may and wickedness as malignant, they will both prove ineffectual against the Church. There resides a power within her that is not of man, but of God, and though her triumph may be delayed, it is sure to be glorious in the end. The Spirit of Truth will once more move over the face of the earth; man's soul will be enlightened, renewed, beautified by grace; materialism, seen in all its grossness and hideous ugliness, will evoke only feelings of loathing disgust, and mankind will turn again in repentant gladness to God.

[1] *Wolfgang Menzel*, reviewing a number of writings on the Cologne Cathedral (in the Literary Fly-leaf of his Morning Gazette, 1843, nros. 1, 2, 3), uses words of similar import; and Frederic William IV., in laying the first stone for the resumption of work on the same cathedral, spoke of "the feelings of brotherly love which the various denominations should bear towards each other, inasmuch as they were all one, being united under one Divine Head."

[2] Acts, xiv. 21. "Will Germany become Catholic?" by the author of Inquiries concerning Catholicism, Protestantism, and Liberty of Conscience, Schaffhausen, 1859. Return to the Catholic Church the Problem of the Age, by a Protestant, Leipsig, 1851.

END OF VOL. IV.

I. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

POPES AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS,

Being a continuation of Vol. III., p. 520.

POPES.	EMPERORS.
Alexander VII., 1655-1667.	Leopold I., 1657-1705.
Clement IX., 1667-1669.	
Clement X., 1670-1676.	
Innocent XI., 1676-1689.	
Alexander VIII., 1689-1691.	
Innocent XII., 1691-1700.	
Clement XI., 1700-1721.	Joseph I., 1705-1711.
Innocent XIII., 1721-1724.	Charles VI., 1711-1740.
Benedict XIII., 1724-1730.	
Clement XII., 1730-1740.	
**Benedict XIV.*, 1740-1758.	Maria Teresa and her consort, Francis I., 1740-1765.
Clement XIII., 1758-1769.	(Charles VII., 1742-1745, Pretender.)
Clement XIV., 1769-1774.	Maria Teresa and her son, Joseph II., 1765-1780.
Pius VI., 1775-1799.	Joseph II., 1780-1790.
Pius VII., 1800-1823.	Leopold II., 1790-1792.
Leo XII., 1823-1829.	Francis II., 1792-1806, when the German Empire was dissolved.
Pius VIII., 1829-1830.	
Gregory XVI., 1831-1846.	
Pius IX., 1846-1878.	
Leo XIII., 1878.	

II. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAGES AND EVENTS DURING THE THIRD PERIOD (1517-1878.)

SECOND EPOCH (1648-1878.)

PART FIRST.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789.)

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1655-1667. *Alexander VII.*, Pope. His bull against the Jansenists, 1656. The Socinians expelled from Poland, 1658. Death of St. Vincent de Paul, 1660. Seminary of the Missions, founded at Paris, 1663. The Order of the Trappists, founded by Bouthillier de Rancé, 1662. Death of Abbess Arnauld of Port-Royal, in 1661, and Peter de Marca, Archbishop of Paris, in 1662. Re-establishment of monarchy in England under Charles II., 1660. In the same year appear the *Critici sacri*, under the editorial management of Pearson. In 1668, Bossuet publishes his *Exposition of Catholic Doctrine*, demonstrating to many of the Reformers that they held wholly erroneous views on Catholicity. Translation of the *Bible of Mons* by Arnauld, the Duke of Luynes, Antoine Lemaistre, and De Sacy, 1667.

1670-1676. Clement X., Pope. Death of Cardinal Bona, 1674. Influence of Bossuet and Bourdaloue as preachers. Marshal Turenne becomes a Catholic, 1699. New Testament of Quesnel, 1671. Spener publishes his *Collegia pietatis*, from 1670, exposing the errors of the Protestant Church. In the same year the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* of Spinoza is published, 1675. *Formula consensus Helvetici*. Death of Paul Gerhard, 1676.

1676-1689. Innocent XI., Pope. His controversy with Louis XIV. on the right of *regalia*, 1682. Defence of the Four Articles by Bossuet. Death of Launoi, 1678. Hypercriticism of Richard Simon. The *Spiritual Guide* of Molinos gives rise to Quietism, in 1675. Sixty-eight propositions extracted from it are condemned. The Barnabite, Lacombe, and Mme. Lamotte Guyon. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in 1685. James II., King of England. Christian Thomasius, compelled to leave Leipsig, withdraws to Halle, in 1694, where he founds a university in conjunction with Francke.

1683. Siege of Vienna by the Turks; forced by Sobieski to raise it. The Polish king dies in 1696.

1691-1700. Innocent XII., Pope. Controversy between Bossuet and Fénélon relative to the teachings of Mme. Guyon. The former composes his *States of Prayer*; the latter his *Maxims of the Saints*, 1697; twenty-three propositions of the latter censured in 1699. Noble victory of the Archbishop of Cambrai over himself. The French episcopacy and Louis XIV. disapprove the Four Articles, in 1692. Attempt to reunite the various religious parties in Hanover through the mediation of Bossuet, Van der Muelen, Spinola, and Leibnitz. Francke, preacher and professor at Halle, 1692.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1697. The Peace of Ryswick declares that in the German countries occupied by France the Catholic religion shall remain in *statu quo*. Frederic Augustus, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, returns to the Catholic Church.

1700-1721. *Clement XI.*, Pope. He protests (1701) against the assumption by Frederic I. of the title of King of Prussia, because that country had been formerly the property of the Church. Tournon, the Pope's Legate, in India and China, 1707. Kodde, Vicar-Apostolic and Administrator of the diocese of Utrecht, is deposed as a Jansenist. Death of Rancé, in 1700; of Bossuet and Bourdaloue, in 1704. Destruction of the Abbey of Port-Royal, in 1708. One hundred and one propositions of the *New Testament* by Quesnel condemned by the bull *Unigenitus*, 1713. Malebranche, Fénélon, and Louis XIV. die, in 1715. The regency is intrusted to the Duke of Orleans. Death of *Du Pin*, in 1719.

1706-1709. Controversy between Pope Clement XI. and Emperor Joseph I., concerning the *right of presentation* and the Duchy of Parma. Charles VI., last emperor of the House of Hapsburg, 1711-1740. Attempt in Berlin to reunite the Lutherans and the Reformed, 1703. Ursinus, Jablonski, and Leibnitz. Deism of the Englishmen, Collins and Tindal, preceded by the empiricism of Locke, who died in 1704. The Earl of Shaftesbury, head of a philanthropical school, dies in 1713.

1721-1723. Innocent XIII., Pope. His negotiations with Emperor Charles VI. He confirms, in France, the Order of the Brothers of Christian Doctrine. Death of the apologist, Huet, in 1721. The "Holy Synod," supreme and permanent, established by Peter I., in 1721. Hans Egede in Greenland. Zinzendorf and the Herrnhutters, from 1722.

1724-1730. Benedict XIII., Pope. He convokes Council of the Lateran in 1725, for the repression of abuses. His controversy with John V., King of Portugal. Institution of the office of *St. Gregory VII.* The Methodists, 1729.

1730-1740. *Clement XII.*, Pope. He is involved in fresh complications with Spain. He issues a bull against Freemasonry (1738). The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, founded by St. Alfonso Maria da Liguori in 1732. The Lutherans emigrate from the Duchy of Salzburg, from 1731 to 1733. The enemies of Christianity, Tindal, Woolston, and De Mandeville, die in 1733. Efforts in France to turn Christianity into ridicule. The Wertheim Bible, 1735. At Amsterdam, the Biblical critic and interpreter, Wetstein.

1740-1758. Important pontificate of Benedict XIV. His splendid work, *De synodo diœcesana*. Maria Teresa, 1740-1780. The learned Muratori, closely connected with the Pope by ties of friendship. Houbigant publishes his critical edition of the Old Testament in 1753. Christianity continues to be attacked by the Atheists and enemies of the Jesuits, Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, the political economists, and J. J. Rousseau. Death of Bengel, at Stuttgart, 1742. Baron Wolf and Wetstein die, in 1754. Death of the learned Mosheim at Goettingen, in 1755, and of Baumgarten at Halle, in 1757.

1758-1769. *Clement XIII.*, Pope. He is harassed on all sides with complaints and accusations against the Jesuits. His bull *Apostolicum*, in their favour, produces no effect. In Portugal, Pombal's influence brings about their suppression, 1759. They are persecuted and suppressed in France, in 1764; in Spain, in 1767; and in Naples, in 1768. Death of Assemani, in 1768. In Germany, French Gallicanism is transformed into Febronianism (Hontheim), 1763. Ernesti, Semler, and Teller, in 1767. Reimarus, in 1768. Controversy on the legality of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, 1766.

1769-1774. Clement XIV., Pope. Joseph II., emperor from 1766 to 1790, is restrained within the limits of decency during the lifetime of Maria Teresa, who dies in 1780. The Bishop of Hildesheim is appointed Vicar-Apostolic of the North. The Pope's brief, *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, sacrifices the Jesuits to the Bourbon Courts. The *System of Nature*, published in 1770, aims at annihilating religion and morality. Death of Swedenborg at London, in 1772.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1775-1799. Pius VI., Pope. From 1780, Joseph II. becomes the leader of the enemies of the Catholic Church; favours the Gallican doctrines of the canonists, Eybel and Ries, as well as Illuminism and Freemasonry; and establishes "General Seminaries." The presence of Pius VI. at Vienna changes but very little the state of affairs. *Punctuation* of Ems. Synod of Pistoia in Tuscany, owing to the protection of the Grand Duke Leopold, brother to the Emperor Scipio Ricci, in 1786. The *Illuminati* in Bavaria. In France, irreligion and war against Catholicity. Warnings and sinister predictions of the clergy, 1780. The interpreter, Eichhorn, lectures at Goettingen, from 1788, and propagates Naturalism. Death of Ernesti and Lessing, in 1781; of Francis Walch, in 1784; of the popular philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, in 1785; of Michaelis and Semler, in 1791. Kant's influence on theology. Frederic William, King of Prussia. Edict concerning religion issued by Minister Woellner, in 1788. Spread of pure Rationalism.

PART SECOND.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO THE PRESENT DAY (1789-1878).

1789. Outbreak of the French Revolution. Joseph II. dies in despondency in 1790. He is succeeded by his brother, Leopold II. (1790-1792), who is in turn succeeded by his son, Francis II. The latter, led by the true spirit of the Holy Christian Empire, declares himself, at a critical moment, the protector of the Roman Church and of the Pope. In America, the See of Baltimore is established.

1789-1791. The Constituent National Assembly of France declares all ecclesiastical possession national property (1789), and establishes a civil constitution for the clergy (1791), forcing them to take a purely civil oath. Reduction of the number of bishoprics.

1791-1795. The Legislative Assembly and the National Convention consummate this impious work. Louis XVI. dies on the scaffold, January 21, 1793. Every vestige of Christianity disappears; the Christian calendar is replaced by the unmeaning Grecian decade; and the Christian worship by the orgies in honour of the Goddess of Reason, November 7, 1793. Robespierre decrees the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, July 8, 1794. Pius VI. protests against all these acts; is made prisoner by the French, and Rome is proclaimed a republic. Death of Pius VI. at Valence, on the 29th of August, 1799. Bonaparte First Consul. Griesbach publishes his edition of the New Testament, 1796-1806.

1800-1823. Pius VII. elected Pope at Venice. Concordat with France, 1801. Influence of Châteaubriand. He publishes his *Genius of Christianity*, in 1802. In Germany, Count Frederic Leopold of Stolberg sets the example of a return to Catholicity. It is followed by a great number of conversions. In Great Britain and America great associations for Protestant foreign missions are founded, while similar societies are formed on the European continent, and missionary training schools are established at Berlin (1806, by Jänicke) and other places.

1801-1803. Resolution of the deputies of the empire concerning the Treaty of Lunéville of 1801: Charles Theodore of Dalberg, last Elector and Archbishop of Mentz, 1802. Secularization of almost all ecclesiastical princedoms in Germany.

1804. The Jesuits restored in Naples. Pius VII. anoints Bonaparte emperor, and is shortly at variance with him.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1806. Dissolution of the German Empire. The Confederation of the Rhine placed under the protection of the Emperor of the French. The States of the Church incorporated into the French Empire, 1809. The Pope carried away to Savona.

1808. The See of Baltimore is raised to metropolitan rank.

1811-1813. The National Council held at Paris completely disappoints the expectations of the emperor, who wished to regulate the affairs of the Church without the concurrence of the Pope. Preliminary articles of a new Concordat.

1814. After Napoleon's abdication, Pius VII. returns to Rome, and by the bull *Solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* re-establishes the Society of Jesus. Soon after Napoleon's return from Elba and the invasion of the Papal States by the troops of Murat, the Pope is obliged to again withdraw from Rome. Napoleon, defeated at Waterloo, is transported for life to St. Helena. The Pope applies to the English to obtain from them some mitigation of the hard lot of his former persecutor. The Holy Alliance of 1815. Conclusion of several Concordats with Catholic and non-Catholic princes of Germany, 1817-1829.

1817-1818. The Irish Catholic Emancipation Bill once more rejected by the English Parliament in 1817. Louis XVIII. renews with the Pope (1817) the Concordat of Leo X. and Francis I., which, however, is not executed. Establishment of the Jesuit College at Fribourg, in Switzerland. The jubilee of the Reformation celebrated in 1817. While irritating to Catholics it laid bare the internal discrepancies of Protestants and their entire relinquishment of the Lutheran symbol. Violent quarrel occasioned by the theses of Nicholas Harms. Missionary societies and training institutes founded at Basle, in 1815 and 1816; and at Berne, in 1824.

1823-1829. *Leo XII.*, Pope. Concordats concluded by him.

1829. In England, the entire episcopacy publishes a declaration, asking for a repeal of the penal laws against Catholics.

1829-1830. *Pius VIII.*, Pope. He is consoled for the revolutionary movements in Italy by the conquest of Algiers, in 1830, and still more by the religious emancipation of the Irish on the 13th of April, 1829. Revolution of July, by which the elder branch of the Bourbons is dethroned, and the Duke of Orleans called to the throne. The St. Simonians. The Evangelical Union of Prussia, in 1830, occasions divers Lutheran movements.

1831. Gregory XVI., Pope (February 2). He displays great energy under adverse circumstances. Death of Hegel and Hermes.

1832. Moehler's Symbolism appears and makes a deep impression all over Germany. Moehler dies on the 12th of April, 1838.

1837. November 20, the "Catastrophe of Cologne," simultaneous with a similar movement at Posen. The Russian institution of the Holy and Permanent Synod is transplanted into Greece, with the approval of the bishops (August 4, 1833), and the Patriarch of Constantinople recognizes the independence of the Orthodox Church in Hellas.

1840. Return of the Archbishop of Posen to his diocese († December 25, 1842.)

1842. Amicable settlement of the Cologne differences. This event causes a very decided reaction in favour of the Catholic Church throughout Germany. Success of missionary efforts. Protestantism more than ever rent by internal dissensions. A great many writers exert themselves to set aside the Gospel and have it replaced by modern philosophy. These attempts give rise to others of a directly opposite character. The General Synod of Berlin, in 1846, re-establishes several religious feasts.

1846. Erection of Oregon city into an archiepiscopal see. Death of Gregory XVI. and accession of Pius IX. His political reforms. The energy displayed by this Pope in the ecclesiastical affairs of every country excites general admiration.

1847. Establishment of the archbishopric of St. Louis.

1848. The general enfranchisement acquired by the people turns to the advantage of the Church, both in Catholic and Protestant countries. Liberty of the press and right of association. Establishment of the *Pius Verein*. Its first general assembly, composed of laymen and ecclesiastics, is held at Mentz from the 3rd to the 5th day of October. The German archbishops and bishops meet at Würzburg from the 22nd of October to the 16th of November. The French prelates at Paris, in 1849. Meeting in other ecclesiastical provinces. Restoration of synods.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1850-1860. The Catholic hierarchy re-established in England, and New York, Cincinnati, and New Orleans created archbishoprics in 1850, and San Francisco, in 1853. Concordats entered into by Pius IX. with Russia, in 1847; with Tuscany and Spain, in 1851; with Costarica and Guatemala, in 1852; with Austria, in 1855; with Würtemberg, in 1857; with the Grand Duchy of Baden, in 1859; and with Nicaragua and San Salvador, in 1861. Solemn proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, December, 1854.

1860-1872. Cialdini's soldiers massacre the insignificant pontifical army near Castel-Fidardo, September 18, 1860. The States of the Church are reduced to the "Patrimony" of St. Peter. Treaty of September 15, 1864, between France and Piedmont. Eighteenth centenary of SS. Peter and Paul, 1867. New revolutionary attempts on Rome. Intervention of France, 1867. Vatican Council, 1869-1870. Franco-German war, 1870. Rome taken by the Piedmontese army, September 20, 1870. Protest of Pius IX., September, 1870. Persecution of the Church in Italy, Switzerland, and Germany, 1872 sq. Revival of the Catholic spirit in France after the war and in countries where the Church is persecuted.

1873. May laws enacted in Germany against the free exercise of Catholic worship. Expulsion of Religious Orders from Germany and other States. Confiscation of Church property in Italy. Exile of Catholic bishops from Germany and Switzerland.

1874. Foundation of a Catholic University in England. Continued persecution of the Church in Germany, Russia, and Switzerland. Incipient persecution in Austria. General persecution of the Catholic press in the European countries. Erection of the province of Melbourne.

1875. Appointment of the first American cardinal. Erection of the ecclesiastical provinces of Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé. Revival of Catholic spirit in Italy, owing to the second Catholic Congress. Progress of higher education in the Catholic universities of France.

1876. Eastern question in Europe. Massacre of Christians in Bulgaria. Servian revolt. Continued interference of the State in matters of religion.

1877. War between Russia and Turkey. June 3, Golden Jubilee of the Episcopate of Pius IX. Establishment of numerous Catholic universities in France amidst threatening prospects for the Catholic Church. Catholic congresses of Bergamo and Würzburg.

1878. Death of Victor Emmanuel, Pius IX., Padre Secchi, and Dr. Alzog. Election of Leo XIII. Catholic hierarchy re-established in Scotland.

III. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

COUNCILS HELD DURING THE THIRD PERIOD, SECOND EPOCH

IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Paris, 1713, 1714, and 1720. Lateran, 1725. Of Mount Lebanon, 1736. False Council of Pistoia, 1785, and the so-called National Council of Florence, 1787; the Congress at Ems of the Rhenish Electors, held in 1786, and the assembly of the "Constitutional" bishops, at Paris, in 1797; and, moreover, that of *Antioch*, in 1806, convoked by Germanus Adami, Abp. of Hierapolis and Visitor Apostolic, the friend of Scipio Ricci, follows in the same drift. On the other hand, the *Assemblée du Clergé*, of 1789, declares against the prevailing irreligiousness and immorality. After these sorry attempts to emulate the greater councils, even the *diocesan synods* disappear in all countries of Europe, *Italy excepted*. *John Carroll*, Bishop of Baltimore, was the first to give the signal of their revival beyond the Atlantic, in 1791.

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Synod of the "Constitutional Bishops" at Paris, 1802. So-called National Council of Paris, 1811. National Council of Hungary, 1822. Beginning of regular *Provincial Councils* at Baltimore, from 1829. In Italy, France, Great Britain, &c., from 1848. At *Rome*, 1854, *Conventus Episcoporum* for the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary; 1862, for the canonization of the Japanese Martyrs; 1867, for the Eighteenth Centenary of the Martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles. In Germany and Austria, assemblies of bishops at Würzburg, Cologne, and Vienna (1848 and 1849); afterwards, the Provincial Councils of *Gran*, 1857; *Vienna*, 1858; Venice, 1859; Prague and Cologne, 1860; Calocza, 1863. *Vatican*, 1869, 1870. (*Twentieth Œcumenical.*)

TABLE

OF ALL THE SEES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

[Compiled from the "Church Almanac" for the year of our Lord, 1878, published at New York, being supplementary to the Ecclesiastical Atlas.]

A.—DIOCESES OF THE UNITED STATES.

ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THEIR ORGANIZATION TOGETHER WITH THE RESIDENCES OF THE INCUMBENTS.

Connecticut, 1783; Middletown.
Maryland, 1783; Baltimore.
Pennsylvania, 1784; Philadelphia.
Massachusetts, 1784; Boston.
New Jersey, 1785; Trenton.
New York, 1785; New York.
South Carolina, 1785; Charleston.
Virginia, 1785; Richmond.
Vermont, 1790; Burlington.
Rhode Island, 1790: Providence.
Delaware, 1791; Wilmington.
New Hampshire, 1802; Concord.
North Carolina, 1816; Wilmington.
Ohio, 1818; Cleveland.
Maine, 1820; Portland.
Georgia, 1823; Atlanta.
Mississippi, 1825; Vicksburg.
Tennessee, 1828; Memphis.
Kentucky, 1829; Louisville.
Alabama, 1830; Mobile.
Michigan, 1832; Detroit.
Illinois, 1835; Chicago.
Western New York, 1838; Buffalo.
Florida, 1838; Jacksonville.
Indiana, 1838; Indianapolis.
Louisiana, 1838; New Orleans.
Missouri, 1839; St. Louis.
Wisconsin, 1847; Milwaukee.
Texas, 1849; Galveston.
California, 1850; San Francisco.
Iowa, 1853; Davenport.
Minnesota, 1857; Faribault.
Kansas, 1859; Topeka.
Pittsburg, 1865; Pittsburg, Pa.
Maine, 1867; Portland, Me.
Nebraska, 1868; Omaha.
Easton, 1868; Easton, Md.
Albany, 1868; Albany.
Central New York, 1868; Syracuse.
Long Island, 1868; Brooklyn, N. Y.
Arkansas, 1871; Little Rock.
Central Pennsylvania, 1871; Reading, Pa.
Western Michigan, 1871; Grand Rapids.
Northern New Jersey, 1874; Orange, N. J.
Fond du Lac, 1875; Fond du Lac.
Southern Ohio, 1875; Cincinnati.
West Virginia, 1877; Wheeling.
Quincy, 1877; Quincy.
Springfield, 1877; Springfield.

"MISSIONS," WITH THE SUBJOINED RESIDENCES PRESIDED OVER BY "MISSIONARY BISHOPS."

Oregon and Washington, Res., Portland: Dakota, Res., Omaha; Colorado, including Wyoming, Res., Denver; Montana, including Utah and Idaho, Res., Salt Lake City, Utah; Nevada, Res., Virginia City; Niobrara, Res., Yankton Agency, Dak.; Northern Texas, Res., Dallas; Western Texas, Res., San Antonio; Northern California, Res., Benicia; New Mexico, including Arizona. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States also provides Missionary Bishops for the foreign missions of Western Africa, Res., Cape Palmas, Lib.; Shanghai, Res., Shanghai, China; Yedo, Res., Yedo, Japan. Total of U. S. Dioceses, 49; of Missions, 13.

B.—COLONIAL AND MISSIONARY SEES.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—*Montreal, Frederickton, Nova Scotia, Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, *Rupert's Land, Toronto, Huron, Moosonee, Algoma, Athabasca, Saskatchevan, Niagara, and Newfoundland.

INDIA.—*Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Lahore, Colombo, and Labuan.

WEST INDIES.—Guiana, Jamaica, Antigua, Trinidad, Barbadoes, and Nassau.

CHINA.—North China and Victoria.

AFRICA.—*Capetown, St. Helena, Niger, Maritzburg, Zululand, Sierra Leone, Grahamstown, Bloemfontein, Mauritius, Kaffraria, Central Africa, and Madagascar.

AUSTRALASIA.—*Sydney, Adelaide, Newcastle, Goulburne, Tasmania, Nelson, Bathurst, Grafton and Armidale, Auckland, Wellington, Dunedin, Ballarat, Brisbane, Melbourne, Perth, and Waiapua.

Gibraltar (Spain), Falkland Islands (South America), Melanesia (Western Pacific), Honolulu (Sandwich Islands), Hayti, and Jerusalem (Palestine.)

Metropolitan.

V. MODERN COUNCILS HELD FROM 1682-1869.

Chronologically arranged by the Translator (according to the "Collectio Lacensis," Freiburg, 1870-1876.)

COUNCIL.	QUALITY.	TIME.	PRESIDENT.	MEMBERS.				EXEMPT.
				APBS.	CARDS.	BPS.	ABBOTS, ETC.	
1st of the Maronites, at Antioch	Provincial (of the Rite)	18 Sept., 1596 ...	Sergius, Patriarch Ant.	3	...	...	2 Deac., many Pr'sts	...
2nd of the Maronites, at Antioch	Provincial (of the Rite)	3 Nov., 1596 ...	Joseph Peter, P. A.	...	Not	given.	.....	...
Paris	Called National	1681, 1682	Francis, Abp. Paris	7	...	26	36	...
Tyrnau (Hungary)	National	24 Oct., 1682 ...	(Litt. Abp.) G. Szebepchény, Abp. Gran.	...	Not	known.	.....	...
Tarragona	1st Provincial ...	1685	Jos. Sanchez, Abp. Tarragona	...	...	6	31	...
Benevento	1st Provincial ...	11, 13, 16 Apl., 1693	Vinc. Maria Card. Orsini, Abp. Benev.	...	...	13	3	...
Benevento	2nd Provincial ...	10, 14, 19 May, 1698	Vinc. Maria Card. Orsini, Abp. Benev.	...	...	14	2	9 Bishops.
Naples	1st Provincial ...	1699	James Card. Cantelmus, Abp. Neap. ...	...	...	4	.....	1 Bishop.
Tarragona	2nd Provincial ...	1699	Joseph Llinas, Abp. Tarr.	...	Not	known.	.....	...
Albania, at Merchigna ...	National	1703	Vincent Zmajewick, Abp. Antibar ...	...	1	4	.....	...
Tarragona, at Barcelona ...	3rd Provincial ...	1712	Fran. Dorda, Ep. Callson (Ap. mortuo)	...	...	...	Not known.	...
Tarragona, at Gerona ...	4th Provincial ...	1717	D. M. Joann. de Taverner, Bp. Gerona	...	...	...	Not known.	...
Ruthenians, at Szamos Ujvar ...	Provincial ...	1720	Jerome, Abp. of Edessa	...	4	5	8 Archimandrites.	...
Tarragona	5th Provincial ...	1722	Emmanuel de Samaniego, Abp. ...	...	...	...	Not known.	...
Rome	Provincial ...	1725	Benedict XIII.	5	32	39	3	About 50 Procuratores.
Avignon	Provincial ...	1725	F. M. de Gonteriis, Abp.	...	...	3	.....	...
Fermo	Provincial ...	1726	Alexander Borgia, Abp.	...	...	4	.....	...
Embrun (Ebrodunens.) ...	Provincial ...	1727	Peter de Guérin, Abp.	...	...	14	.....	...
Tarragona	6th Provincial ...	1727	Emmanel de Samaniego, Abp. ...	...	Not	known.	Not known.	...
Tarragona	7th Provincial ...	1733	Peter Copons, Abp.	...	Not	known.	Not known.	...
3rd of the Maronites (the most celebrated), in the Lebanon ...	For the whole Rite ...	1736	Jos. Peter Gazenus, Patr. of Antioch	...	...	62	.....	About 50.
Tarragona	8th Provincial	1738	Peter Copons, Abp.	...	Not	known.	.....	...
Tarragona	9th Provincial	1752	Peter Copons, Abp.	...	Not	known.	.....	...
Baltimore	Diocesan (for all the U.S. of N.A.)	1791	John Carroll, Bp.	...	...	...	22 Priests.	...
4th of the Maronites*	Provincial	1806	Not known	...	Not	known.	.....	...
Baltimore	Informal Synod	1810	John Carroll, Abp.	...	...	5	.....	...
Paris	National	11 June, 1811 ...	Jos. Fesch, Card. (Napol.)	12	5	87	.....	...
Of the Melchites (Mt. Lebanon)	Patriarchal	1812	Not given	...	Not	given.	.....	...
Tuam	1st Provincial	6, 7, 8 May, 1817	Oliver Kelley, Abp.	...	...	6	.....	...

Not approved by the Holy See.

MODERN COUNCILS.—*Continued.*

COUNCIL.	QUALITY.	TIME.	PRESIDENT.	MEMBERS.				EXEMPT.
				ABPS.	CARDS.	PS.	ABBOTS, ETC.	
5th of the Maronites ...	National	1818	John Dolce, Patr.	...	...	...	.....	...
Baltimore	1st Provincial	4 Oct., 1829 ...	James Whitfield, Abp.	...	...	5	1 Administrator.	...
Baltimore	2nd Provincial	20 Oct., 1833 ...	James Whitfield, Abp.	...	...	9	.....	...
Of the Melchites (Ain-Traz) ...	Patriarchal	1835	Maximus Mazlum, Patr.	...	Not	given.	.....	...
Baltimore	3rd Provincial	16 April, 1837 ...	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.	...	...	9	.....	...
Baltimore	4th Provincial	17 May, 1840 ...	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.	...	...	12	.....	...
Baltimore	5th Provincial	14 May, 1843 ...	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.	...	...	15	1 Vicar-General.	...
Sydney (Australia)	1st Provincial	10 Sept., 1844 ...	John Beda Polding, Abp. Syd. ...	...	...	2	.....	...
Baltimore	6th Provincial	10 May, 1846 ...	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.	...	...	22	.....	...
Oregon	Provincial	28 Feb., 1848 ...	Francis Norbert Blanchet, Abp. ...	...	...	2	1 Presbyter.	...
Paris	Informal Synod ...	28 Feb., 1849 ...	Maria D. A. Sibour, Abp.	...	1	12	.....	...
Baltimore	7th Provincial ...	6th May, 1849 ...	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.	...	1	23	.....	...
Paris	Provincial	17 Sept., 1849 ...	Maria D. A. Sibour, Abp.	...	...	4	.....	...
Soissons (Prov. Rheims) ...	1st Provincial	1 Oct., 1849 ...	Thomas M. J., Card. Gousset, Abp. ...	...	...	3	1 Procurator.	...
Tours	Provincial	11 Nov., 1849 ...	Francis N. M. Morlot, Abp.	...	...	7	.....	...
Avignon	Provincial	8 Dec., 1849 ...	John M. Debalay, Abp.	...	...	4	.....	...
Alby	Provincial	23 June, 1850 ...	John J. M. A. de Jerphanion, Abp. ...	...	...	3	.....	...
Lyons	Provincial	30 June, 1850 ...	Louis, J. M., Card. de Bonald, Abp. ...	...	...	3	1 Procurator.	...
Rouen	Provincial	8 July, 1850 ...	Louis M. E. Blanquart de Bailleal, Abp.	...	...	4	.....	...
2nd Thurles (Ireland)	Plenary	22 Aug., 1850 ...	Paul Cullen, Abp. Armagh	...	3	20	3 Procurat., 1 Abbot.	...
1st Bordeaux	1st Provincial	14 July, 1850 ...	Ferdinand, F. A., Card. Donnet, Abp.	...	...	8	1 Procurator.	...
Sens	Provincial	2 Sept., 1850 ...	Mellon Jolly, Abp.	...	...	3	.....	...
Aix	Provincial	8 Sept., 1850 ...	Peter M. J. Darcimoles, Abp.	...	...	6	.....	...
Toulouse	Provincial	10 Sept., 1850 ...	Paul Th. D. d'Astros, Abp.	...	...	3	1 Coadjutor Arch.	...
Bourges, at Clermont	Provincial	6 Oct., 1850 ...	Jas. M. A. Celestin, Card. du Sont, Abp.	...	...	4	.....	...
Quebec	1st Provincial	15 Aug., 1851 ...	Peter Fl. Turgeon, Abp.	...	...	7	.....	...
Auch	Provincial	20 Aug., 1851 ...	Nic. Aug. de la Croix d'Azolette ...	...	...	3	.....	...
Baltimore	1st Plenary	9 May, 1852 ...	Francis Patrick Kenricks, Abp. Balt. ...	...	5	26	.....	...
Westminster...	1st Provincial	7 July, 1852 ...	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp. ...	...	...	10	2 Procuratores	...
Amiens (Prov. Rheims)	2nd Provincial	10 Jan., 1853 ...	Thomas M. J., Card. Gousset, Abp. ...	...	...	3	1 Procurator.	...
Dublin	Provincial	2 June, 1853 ...	Paul Cullen, Abp.	...	...	3	.....	3 Ex-Bishop.
Bordeaux (La Rochelle)	2nd Provincial	23 July, 1853 ...	Ferd. Card. Donnet, Abp.	...	...	7	1 Procurator.	...
Cashel	Provincial	1 Sept., 1853 ...	Michael Slattery, Abp.	...	...	8	1 Abbot.	...
Armagh	Provincial	10 May, 1854 ...	Joseph Dixon, Abp.	...	...	7	1 Procurator.	
Dublin	*Conventus*	19 May, 1854 ...	Paul Card. Cullen, Abp.	...	Not	given.	All Bps. of Ireland represented.	...
Quebec	2nd Provincial	23 May, 1854 ...	Peter Fl. Turgeon, Abp.	...	...	8	.....	...
Port of Spain	Provincial	22 June, 1854 ...	Joach. Louis Gonin, Abp.	...	...	3 Vi.-Ap.	.....	..
Tuam	2nd Provincial	15 Aug., 1854 ...	John McHale, Abp.	...	...	4	2 Procuratores.	...
New York	Provincial	1 Oct., 1854 ...	John Hughes, Abp.	...	...	7	.....	...
Baltimore	8th Provincial	6 May, 1854 ...	F. P. Kenrick, Abp.	...	...	5	2 Administrators.	...
Cincinnati	1st Provincial	13 May, 1855 ...	J. B. Purcell, Abp.	...	...	6	.....	2
Westminster	2nd Provincial	11 July, 1855 ...	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp. ...	...	...	10	3 Vicarii Cap., 1 Ab.	...

St. Louis	1st Provincial	7 Oct., 1855	Peter Rich. Kenrick, Abp.					5	.....		
New Orleans	1st Provincial	20 Jan., 1856	Anthony Blanc, Abp.					4	.....		
Bordeaux (Périgneux)	3rd Provincial	2 Aug., 1856	Ferdinand F. A. Card. Donnet, Abp.					6	3 Procuratores.		
Halifax	Provincial	8 Sept., 1857	William Walsh, Abp.					3	.....		
Rheims	3rd Provincial	18 Nov., 1857	Thos. Card. Gousset, Abp.					4	.....		
Baltimore	9th Provincial	2 May, 1858	Francis P. Kenrick, Abp.					7	Several Superiors of Orders *sine voto.*		
Cincinnati	2nd Provincial	2 May, 1858	John B. Purcell, Abp.					6	.....		
Tuam	3rd Provincial	10 Aug., 1858	John McHale, Abp.					6	1 Coadjutor.		
St. Louis	2nd Provincial	5 Sept., 1858	Peter R. Kenrick, Abp.					7	1 Administrator.		
Westminster	3rd Provincial	13 July, 1859	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp.					11	1 Coadjutor.		
Bordeaux (Agen.)	4th Provincial	8 Sept., 1859	Ferdinand F. A. Card. Donnet, Abp.					7	2 Procuratores.		
New York*	2nd Provincial	19 Jan., 1860	John Hughes, Abp.					7	1 Procurator.		
New Orleans	2nd Provincial	22 Jan., 1860	Anthony Blanc, Abp.					5	.....		
Baltimore†	Informal Synod	22 Jan., 1860	.....						.....		
Cincinnati	3rd Provincial	29 April, 1861	John B. Purcell, Abp.					7	.....		
New York	3rd Provincial	2 June, 1861	John Hughes, Abp.					7	.....		
Quebec	3rd Provincial	14 May, 1863	Chas. Fr. Baillargon, Administrator					7	.....		
Armenian (Bzommar)	For the whole Rite	15 Sept., 1866	Melchior Nazarian, Patriarch			7			.....		
Baltimore	2nd Plenary	7 Oct., 1866	Martin John Spalding, Abp. Balt.			6		36	1 Aux., 1 Adm'r., 1 Procurator, 2 Abb's.		
Port of Spain	2nd Provincial	13 Jan., 1867	Joachim Louis Gonin, Abp.					3	.....		
Bordeaux (Poitiers)	5th Provincial	12 Jan., 1868	Ferd. Fr. A. Card. Donnet, Abp.					5	1 Vic. Capit., 2 Procuratores.		
Quebec	4th Provincial	7 May, 1868	Chas. Fr. Baillargon, Abp.					8	2 Procuratores.		
Sydney (Australia)	Informal Synod	7 Aug., 1868	John Beda Polding, Abp.					5	.....		
Melbourne (Australia)	2nd Provincial	18 April, 1869	John Beda Polding, Abp. Sydney					7	.....		
Baltimore	10th Provincial	25 April, 1869	Martin John Spalding, Abp.					11	1 Abbot.		

* This Council issued no decrees.

† This Synod published a circular letter.

GENERAL INDEX.

THE ROMAN FIGURE INDICATES THE VOLUME, THE ARABIC FIGURE THE PAGE.

A.

Abbacomites, II., 118, 260.
Abbates legitimi, II., 118.
Abasgi, I., 350.
Abdas, Bp. of Susa, I., 349.
Abelard, II., 536, 538; III., 157.
Abo, See of, II., 167.
Abo of Fleury, II., 223.
Abraham a Sancta Clara, IV., 58.
Abraxas, I., 217.
Absalom, Bp. of Röskilde, II., 575.
Abyssinia, I., 352, IV., 325.
Acacius, Patr. of Constantinople, I., 429.
Acacius, Bishop of Amida, I., 349.
Acacius, Bishop of Berea, I., 420.
Acacius, Bp. of Melitene, I., 422.
Academy of the Cath. Religion, IV., 150.
Academicians, I., 65.
Acephali, I., 430.
Acolyths, I., 274.
Acta facientes, I., 189.
Acta Martyrum, I., 17.
Acta Sanctorum Bollandi, I., 17.
Adalbero, Bp. of Würzburg, II., 356.
Adalbert the Frank, heretic, II., 127.
Adalbert, Archbp. of Bremen, II., 170.
Adalbert, Archbp. of Magdeburg, II., 267.
Adalbert, Bp. of Prague, II., 177, 180, 182, 223.
Adalbert, Bp. of Wollin, II., 575.
Adam of Bremen, I., 29.
Adamnan, II., 69.
Adelphius and the Adelphians, I., 532.
Adiaphoristic (controversy), III., 276.
Administrators, I., 455; II., 97.
Adoptionism, II., 128.
Adoration of the Eucharist, I., 503.
Advent, I., 491.
Advocati, togati et armati, II., 97.
Advocatia ecclesiæ, II., 97.
Aëdisius, I., 352.
Aegidius (Giles), of Viterbo, III., 75, 146.
Aegidius of Colonna, II., 448, note 1.
Aelurus, priest, I., 428.
Aeneas Sylvius, III., 55, 57.
Aërius, priest of Sebaste, I., 533.
Aëtius, deacon of Antioch, I., 377.
Afra, I., 195.
Africa (Propagation of Christianity in). See *Propagation of Christianity.*
Agapae, I., 147, 306; they are forbidden, 306, 507.
Agapete I., Pope, I., 433.
Agapete II., Pope, II., 214.
Agatho, Pope, I., 448.
Agenda (controversy on the), IV., 361.
Ἁγιασμός (φωτισμός), I,, 292.
Agnes, Empress, II., 234.
Agnes, Martyr, I., 195.
Agnoëtians, I., 431.
Agobard of Lyons, II., 298.
Agonistics, I., 360.
Agricola (John), III., 276, 404.
Agrippinus, Bp. of Carthage, I., 166.
Aidan, Bishop, II., 56.
Aix-la-Chapelle (Councils of), II., 117, 133, 200.
Aizana, I., 352.
Alanus of Ryssel, or ab Insulis, II., 543; III., 158.
Alaric, II., 19.
Albanians, I., 350.
Albert the Great, II., 550, 572.
Albert of Brandenburg, Archbp. of Mentz, III., 188.
Albert, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, III., 290.
Albigenses (the), II., 476.
Alboin, II., 90.
Alboin the Saxon, II., 90.
Alcuin, II., 125, 131, 274.
Alemannian law, II., 74.
Alessandria, II., 403.

Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, I., 363.
Alexander, Bp. of Flaviades, and later on Patr. of Jerusalem, I., 190, 262.
Alexander of Hales. II., 516, 550, 572.
Alexander of Hierapolis, I., 422.
Alexander Severus, I., 186.
Alexander I., Pope, I., 287.
Alexander II., Pope, II., 238.
Alexander III., Pope, II., 167, 401, 462, 477.
Alexander IV., Pope, II., 429.
Alexander V., Pope, III., 30.
Alexander VI., Pope, III., 67.
Alexander VII., Pope, IV., 3.
Alexander VIII., Pope, IV., 7.
Alexandria (Councils of), I., 365, 380, 417.
Alexandria, Neo-platonist School of, I., 201, 343.
Alexandrian School, I., 260, 394, 457.
Alexian (the Brothers), II., 520.
Alfred the Great, II., 192, 274, 297.
Algiers, IV., 336.
Allah Taala, II., 139, note 1.
Allegorical interpretation of the Gnostics, I., 214; of Origen, I., 265.
Allegri, III., 490.
Alliance (the Holy), IV., 148.
All-saints, Feast of, II., 286.
All-souls Day, II., 286.
Alogi, I., 243.
Alphonso IX., King of Leon, II., 414.
Altar, I., 313; plurality of altars, I., 483.
Altman, Bp. of Passau, II., 269.
Alvarus Pelagius, III., 13.
Amalarius of Metz, II., 300.
Amalarius of Treves, II., 126.
Amalric of Bena, II., 419.
Amandus, Bp. of Strasburg, II., 80.
Ambrosian (Ecclesiastical Chant), I., 487.
Ambrosian Hymn, I., 487.
Ambrose (St.), Bp. of Milan, I., 344, 384, 395, 486, 510, 531; II., 31.
America (Introduction and Spread of Christianity in). See *Propagation of Christianity.*
Ammianus Marcellinus, I., 321, 380, 461.
Ammonius (the Monk), I, 527.
Ammonius Saccas (the philosopher), I., 201.
Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium, I., 382.
Amsdorf, III., 261, 266.
Anabaptists, III., 220, 247, 384.
Anabaptists of Münster, III, 262.
Analogia fidei, III., 401.
Anastasius I., Pope, I., 389.
Anastasius II., Pope, II., 36.
Anastasius I., Emperor, I., 430.
Anastasius II., Emperor, I., 451.
Anastasius, Roman Librarian, I., 29.
Anastasius of Thessalonica, I., 473.
Anatolius, Patr., of Const., I., 425.
Anchorites, I., 315, 525.
Ancient documents, I., 19, note 2.
Ancyra (synod of), I., 378.
Anderson (Lawrence), III., 305.
Andreae, Valentine, Chancellor, III., 403.
Andrew, Apostle, I., 129.
Andrew of Pisa, III., 168.
Angelomus, Monk of Luxeuil, II., 299.
Angelus Silesius, III., 489.
Anglo-Saxons, II., 38, 273.
Anglican Church, III., 324.
Anicetus, Pope, I., 309.
Annam, IV., 321.
Anniversary, I., 316.
Annunciation (Feast of the), I., 492.
Anomoeians, I., 376.
Anselm of Canterbury, II., 376, 530.
Anselm of Laon, II., 563.
Ansgar (St.), II., 163.
Anthemius, I., 341.
Anthimus, Bp. of Trebisond, I., 433.
Anthropomorphists, I., 389.
Antididagma of the Metropolitan Chapter of Cologne, III., 268.
Antinomistical (Controversy), III., 404.
Antioch (Christian Community of), I., 123, 163.
Antioch (School of), I., 270, 394, 413, 457.
Antioch (Arian Symbols of), I., 377.
Antioch (Councils of), I., 244, 255, 374.
Anthony (St.), the Hermit, I., 315, 524.
Anthony of Padua, II, 517.
Anthonists, or Hospitalers, II., 500.
Antitrinitarians, I., 242; III., 418.
Antoninus, Pius, I., 183.
Antoninus (St.), Archbp. of Florence, I., 30; III., 169.
Apelles, I, 230.
Apocryphal books on the Life of Jesus, I., 115; and the Apostles, I., 162.
Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Apologist, I., 203.
Apollinaris (father and son) of Laodicea, I., 393, 486.
Apollinaris of Ravenna, I., 166.
Apollinarists, I., 393.
Apollonius of Tyana, I., 70.
Apologists, Christian, I., 203, 341; II., 149.
Apostles, I., 109; their labours, I., 117.

Apostolic Brethren, II., 484.
Apostolic Canons and Constitutions, I., 162.
Apostolic Fathers, I., 160.
Apostolic Age, I., 161.
Appellants, IV., 23, 24.
Appeal from the Church to the State, first instance of, I., 359.
Appeals to the Pope, I., 469; II., 454.
Appeals from the Pope to a General Council, II., 450; forbidden, III., 41.
Applause in Church, I., 499.
Aquarians, I., 228.
Aquila, I., 124.
Aquileja (Synod), I., 442.
Arabia (Christianity in), I., 164, 351.
Arausio (Orange), Synod, I., 412.
Arcadius, I., 340.
Archbishop, I., 464.
Archdeacons, I., 273, 456; II., 254, 464; sometimes laymen, II., 101.
Archdiaconate and archpresbyterate, II., 101.
Archpriests, I., 456; II., 254.
Architecture, Gothic or Germanic, III., 160.
Archivists, I., 456.
Arethas, Bp. of Cæsarea, II., 335.
Ariald, II., 271.
Arianism, I., 363.
Arianism, gradual extinction of, I., 380.
Aristides, Apologist, I., 203.
Aristotle, I., 64; and especially, II., 527, 533, 549.
Arius, I., 362, 370.
Arles (Councils of), I., 295, 310, 359, 376; II., 117.
Armagh (See of), II., 42.
Armenia, Christian, I., 350, 443; III., 95.
Arminius, and the Arminians, III., 412.
Armistice (Canonical). See *Truce of God.*
Arnauld, I., 33; III., 477; IV., 19.
Arnaud Angelica, IV., 20.
Arndt (True Christianity by), III., 402.
Arnobius, Apologist, I., 205.
Arnold (Ch. Historian), I., 39.
Arnold of Brescia, II., 389, 480.
Arnold of Citeaux, II., 477.
Arras (See of), II., 80.
Art (religious), I., 312, 484; III., 160.
Artemon, Antitrinitarian, I., 243.
Articles (the Thirty-nine) of the Anglican Church, III., 330.
Ascension of Our Lord (Feast of the), I., 310, 489.
Ascetics, I., 315.
Ascetical (life), I., 315.
Ashebetus, Bp., I., 351.
Askidas, Bp. of Cæsarea, I., 435.
Assemani, I., 35; IV., 45.
Asses (Feast of), II., 569.
Assumption (feast of the). See *Festum Assumptionis B. M. V.*
Asylum, ecclesiastical, I., 454.
Asylums, for the poor, orphans, sick, II., 460.
Ataulf or Aistolphus, II., 19.
Athanasius (St.) I., 345, 368, 421, 453, 527.
Athanasius (St.) asks the protection of Pope Julius, I., 373.
Athanasius (St.) is the first who bears the title of archbishop, I., 465, note 1.
Athenagoras, Apologist, I., 204.
Athens sees the re-opening of the Neo-Platonist School and its suppression, I., 343, 344.
Athens an archiepiscopal see, IV., 318.
Attempt against the Temporal Power of the Pope, IV., 141, 157, 223 sq.
Attila, II., 24.
Atto, Bp. of Vercelli, II., 304.
Aubespine, I., 33.
Audius and the Audians, I., 531.
Augsburg (Diet and Confession of), III., 234.
Augsburg (Religious peace of), III., 278.
Augusti, I., 42.
Augustine (St.), Bp. of Hippo, I., 237, 294, 341, 347, 357, 383; 403, 411, 457, 472, 487; II., 31.
Augustine (St. His opinion on the civic virtues of the Romans, II., 19.
Augustine of Canterbury, II., 47.
Augustinus Triumphus, III., 13.
Augustinians, II., 519; IV., 332.
Aurelius, Bp. of Carthage, I., 401.
Auricular Confession, I., 296; II., 571.
Austerity, exaggerated, of some Christians, I., 318; III., 173.
Australasia, IV., 345.
Auxilius, Bp., II., 41.
Avars (the), II., 336.
Avignon, III., 3.
Avila, III., 481.
Avitus, Bp. of Vienne, II., 37.
Axuma. I., 352.
Azymites, I., 506; II., 333.

B.

Baader, IV., 293.
Babylas, Bp. of Antioch, I., 190, 335.
Bacon (Roger), II., 524, 559.
Baco of Verulam, IV., 69, note 3; 85, note 4.
Barhdt, IV., 88.

Baius (Michael), III., 482.
Balaamites, I., 156.
Balde (James), S.J., III., 452.
Ballerini, IV., 44.
Ballerini (Peter), IV., 50.
Balmes, IV., 175.
Baltzer, IV., 294.
Baluze, I., 33.
Bamberg (See of), II., 268.
Baptism, I., 144, 289, 494.
Baptism of St. John, I., 101.
Baptism first ordinarily administered by bishops, I., 271, 496; in case of necessity, laics might administer it, I., 291, 496; time fixed for solemn baptism I., 291, 496; II., 288; putting off receiving baptism until death, I., 292, 495; putting off the baptism of children, I., 496; II., 288; ceremonies of baptism, I., 495; baptismal feast of the Basilidians, I., 218; blessing of the baptismal water, I., 495.
Baptism (infants putting off of), I., 496; II, 288.
Baptisteries, I., 483, 496.
Baradai (James), I., 443.
Barbara, I., 196.
Bar Cochba, I., 163.
Bardesanes, the Gnostic, I., 226.
Bardo, Archbp. of Mentz, II., 269.
Barletta (Gabriel), III., 159.
Barnabas (St.), I., 129.
Barnabites, III., 456.
Baronius (Cæsar), I., 32; III., 481.
Barruel, IV., 110.
Barsumas, Bp. of Nisibis, I., 442.
Bartholomew (St.), in India, I., 129.
Bartholomew Holzhauser, III., 445.
Bartholomew's (St.) Day, III., 378.
Bartolino of Placenza, III., 24.
Bartolomeo (Fra), III., 169.
Basil (St.), Bp. of Ancyra, I., 377.
Basil (St.) the Great, I., 381, 528.
Basil the Macedonian, II., 324.
Basilicæ, I., 480 sq.
Basilides the Gnostic, I., 215.
Basilicus, Emperor, I., 429
Basle (Council of), III., 44.
Basnage (James and Samuel), I., 43.
Bauer (Bruno), IV., 353, 358.
Baur (of Tübingen), I., 42; IV., 351, 358.
Baumgarten, IV., 61.
Bautain, IV., 258, 304.
Bavaria, II., 73; III., 452, 498.
Bayle, IV., 38.
Beatrice, Margravine of Tuscany, II., 354.
Beatus, Abbot of Libana, II., 130.
Beausobre, I., 43.
Becanus, III., 477.
Bec (Abbey and School of), II., 266.
Becker, I., 37.
Becket (St. Thomas à), II., 404.
Bede, the Venerable, I., 28; II., 123, 273.
Beduins, II., 139.
Beghards, Beguines, Begutts, II., 485, 520; III., 10.
Béla, II., 182.
Belgium, III., 382 sq.; IV., 187, sq. 265.
Belisarius, II., 23.
Bellarmin, III., 474.
Bellini, Giovanni, III., 172.
Bells, I., 484.
Bembo, III., 135.
Benedict II., Pope, II., 103.
Benedict III., II., 198.
Benedict IV., II., 213.
Benedict V., II., 220.
Benedict VI., II., 222.
Benedict VII., II., 222.
Benedict VIII., II., 226.
Benedict IX., II., 229.
Benedict X., II., 235.
Benedict XI., III., 3.
Benedict XII., III., 15.
Benedict XIII., III., 25, 487.
Benedict XIV., IV., 11, 104.
Benedict (St.) of Aniane, II., 132, 260.
Benedict Cajetanus, II., 445.
Benedict Levita, II., 196, 247.
Benedict (St.) of Nursia, II., 32.
Benedictines, II., 32, 260, 488; IV., 33, 204; in the U.S., IV., 332.
Benno (St.), Bp. of Meissen, II., 178.
Bérault-Bercastel, I., 34.
Berengar of Tours, II., 265, 318.
Bergen (See of), II., 168.
Bernard (St.) of Clairvaux, II., 388, 491; III., 157.
Bernard (St.), Apostle of the Pomeranians, II., 113; IV., 187.
Bernhardi, III., 218.
Bernward, Bp. of Hildesheim, II., 268, 284.
Bertha, Frankish Princess, II., 48.
Berthes, I., 38.
Berthold of Calabria, II., 497.
Berthold, Bp. of Chiemsee, III., 474.
Berthold, Bp. of Yxküll, II., 576
Berti (Lawrence), I., 36; IV., 45.
Bertrand de Got, III., 4.
Bérulle, III., 458.
Beryllus, Bp. of Bostra, I., 248.
Bessarion, III., 85, 135.
Beurreus (Denys), III., 307.
Beveridge, I., 43.
Beza (Theodore de), III., 285, 307, 401.

Bialobrzeski, III., 301.
Bible Societies (Protestant), IV., 378 sq.
Bible reading of the), III., 141; translations of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, I., 350; II., 17; III., 99, 141, 246.
Biblia Pauperum, III., 159.
Biel (Gabriel), III., 126.
Billuart, I., 329; IV., 32.
Bingham, I., 43.
Binterim, I., 14; II., 11; IV., 105.
Birkowski, III., 301.
Birthday for Heaven, I., 209.
Bishops, I., 139 sq.; have the precedence of priests, I., 139, 270; St. Jerome's view on this subject, I., 140; their relation to their dioceses, I., 461; II., 25; and with the Pope, II., 251, 453; III., 79; they are called priests, I., 141, 271; and exercise supreme authority over both clergy and laity, I., 139; jurisdiction of bishops, I., 324, 454; they are obliged to visit prisoners every Wednesday and Friday, I., 454; rural bishops or chorepiscopi, I., 274, 456; II., 102.
Blanc, I., 35.
Blood, Congregation of the Most Precious, IV., 333.
Blumauer, Aloysius, IV., 51.
Bobbio, II., 76.
Boccaccio, III., 134.
Bochart (Samuel), III., 394.
Bockelsohn (John), III., 263.
Bockhold (John), III., 263.
Boehme (James), III., 403.
Boëthius, II., 26, 122.
Bogomiles, II., 581.
Bogoris, Bulgarian Prince, II., 337.
Bohemia (conversion of), II., 166.
Bohemian or Moravian Brethren, III., 113, 296.
Bojoari, II., 78.
Boleslaus the Pious, II., 177.
Boleslaus Chrobry, II., 174.
Boleslaus II., II., 181.
Boleslaus III., (*Krizywousty*), II., 180, note.
Bolivia, IV., 343.
Bollandists, I., 17, note 1.
Bona (Cardinal), IV., 43.
Bonaventure (St.), II., 433, 517, 564; III., 158.
Bonfrère III., 478.
Boniface (St.), (Winfrid), II., 72 sq.; introduces the custom of holding regular annual synods, II., 86.
Boniface VI., Pope, II., 210.
Boniface VIII., II., 441.
Boniface IX., III., 24.
Boniface, See of St., IV., 328.
Bonosus (Bp. of Sardica), I., 393, 534.
Book (Cath. Book Associations), IV., 287.
Book of Common Prayer, III., 325.
Books (Censorship of), III., 72; IV., 306.
Boos (Martin), IV., 309.
Borgia (St. Francis), III., 453.
Börglum (See of), II., 166.
Borromeo (St. Charles), III., 429, 480, 492.
Borziwoi, II., 176.
Bossuet, I., 34; III., 4, note, 284; IV., 20, 32, 33, 47.
Boulogne (Abbe de), IV., 163.
Bourdaloue, IV., 34.
Bradwardine, III., 126.
Braga (Council of), I., 531.
Brandenburg (See of), II., 178.
Brazil, III., 471; IV., 76, 343.
Bread used in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, I., 147, 506; II., 333.
Bremen, II., 90, 162.
Brenner, IV., 295.
Brenz, III, 237, 242, 407.
Brephotrophia, II., see *Infant Asylums*.
Breslau, II., 176, note; III., 292.
Brethren (the so-called of Jesus), I., 101, note 3.
Brethren of the Free Spirit, II., 484.
Brethren of the Common Life, III., 151.
Bretagne, or Brittany, II., 38.
Britain (Conversion of), II., 38.
Bridget (St.), II., 43.
Bridget (St.), or Birgit, or Brigitte, III., 21, 131, 147, 150.
Brothers of Mercy and Christian Charity, III., 448.
Brothers of the Christian Schools, IV., 333.
Brothers of Mary, IV., 333.
Bruno (St.), Founder of the Carthusians, II., 495.
Bruno, Bp. of Cologne, II., 267.
Brunswick (turns Protestant), III., 266.
Bucer, III., 242, 261, 401.
Budæus (latinised of Wm. Bude), III., 138.
Buddhism, I., 54.
Buenos Ayres, IV., 344.
Bugenhagen, III., 314.
Bulgarians, II., 336.
Bull *In Cœna Domini*, III., 436, 443; IV., 13.
Bullinger (Henry), III., 250.
Burgundians, II., 23.
Burial, Christian, I., 311, 517.
Burial, Ecclesiastical, refused, I., 518.

Burkhard of Worms, II., 248, 268, 302.
Burkhard of Würzburg, II., 88.
Burmah, IV., 321.
Bursfeld (Congregation of), III., 149.
Busch (John), III., 148.
Busenbaum, III., 476; IV., 32.
Buxtorf, III., 401.
Bzovius, I., 32.

C.

Cacault, IV., 129.
Cadalous of Parma, II., 239.
Cæcilian of Carthage, I., 358.
Cælestius, I., 400.
Cæsar, Augusta. See *Saragossa.*
Cæsarea (School of), I., 457.
Cæsaropapacy, III., 495.
Caillou, IV., 260.
Caïnites, I., 221.
Cajetan, III., 79, 193, 477.
Calasanz, III., 462.
Calderon, III., 487.
Calixt (George), III., 410; IV., 81.
Calixtines, III., 111.
Calixtus II., Pope, II., 384.
Calixtus III., Pope, III., 60.
Calmet, IV., 34.
Calovius, III., 410, 497.
Calvin, III., 280 sq.; his system, III., 286; and his exegesis, III., 401.
Camaldoli (Congregation of), II., 262.
Camaldolites, II., 262.
Campeggio, III., 215, 316.
Canada, IV., 328.
Canisius, III., 452, 476.
Canon (of the Mass), I., 502.
Canon of the O. and N. T., I., 354; II., 116.
Canonical (Life), II., 116.
Canonici, II., 253; regulares et sæculares.
Canonization, II., 286.
Canon Law, Studies of, II., 458.
Canons (Collection of), I., 478; II., 196.
Canossa (Henry IV. at), II., 360.
Canterbury (metropolis), II., 49, 273.
Canus (Melchior), III., 473.
Canute the Great, II., 168; (St.), 216.
Cape of Good Hope, IV., 323.
Capital punishment decreed against heretics, I., 531; II., 341, 480; III., 121; and justified by Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin, III., 394; who put it in execution, III., 284.
Capitation tax paid by the Christians, II., 149, 279.
Capito, III., 248, 254.
Capitula clausa, II., 463.
Capitularies of Charlemagne, II., 133.
Capitularies of Interrogation, II., 120.
Capua (Council of), II., 369.
Capuchins (Order of), III., 454.
Carraccioli, III., 203.
Cardinals, II., 248, 462; red and black, IV., 139, 141.
Carinthians, II., 174.
Carlstadt, III., 193, 218, 252.
Carmelites, II., 498.
Carpocrates, I., 224.
Carpzov, IV., 81, 83.
Cartesius, IV., 31.
Carthage, I., 165.
Carthage, Metropolitan Church of Western Africa, I., 165.
Carthage (Councils of), I., 166, 294, 301, 361, 401, 507.
Carthusians, II., 403, 494.
Casas (Bartholomew de Las), III., 178.
Casimir I., II., 180.
Cassander (George), III., 494.
Cassian (John), I., 410; II., 31.
Cassiodorus, I., 27; II., 26, 122.
Castellio, III., 284, 403.
Castelnau (Peter of), II., 477.
Castro (Christopher), III., 479.
Cataphrygians, I., 240.
Catechetical (School of Alexandria), I., 260.
Catechism (the Roman), III., 433; IV., 71.
Catechumenate, I., 290, 495, 508; studies made in it, I., 295.
Catechumenate of the Manichæans, I., 237.
Cathari, II., 474; divers names of the C., II., 476.
Catharine of Sienna, III., 23, 145.
Cathedral Chapters, II., 463.
Cathedral Chapters enact their own statutes, II., 463.
Cathedral Chapters independently administer their own estates, II., 463.
Cathedral Chapters exclusively elect the bishops, II., 463.
Cathedral schools, II., 126, 297, 524.
Cave (William), I., 43.
Ceillier, I., 17, 33; IV., 34.
Celestine I., Pope, I., 411.
Celestine V., Pope, II., 439.
Celibacy, I., 277, 458; II., 348.
Celsus, I., 199.
Cenobites, I., 527.
Censorship of Books, III., 70.
Central America, IV., 341.
Centuriators, I., 32.
Cerdo, I., 228.
Cerinthus, I., 157.
Cerularius (Michael), II., 332.

Ceylon, I., 351.
Chabot, the Capuchin, IV., 118.
Chalcedon (Council of), I., 426.
Chalcidius (Neo-Platonist), I., 343.
Chaldean Christians, I., 423.
Challoner, III., 316; IV., 182.
Châlons (Council of), II., 120, 264.
Chantal (St. Frances of), III., 454.
Chanters, I., 456.
Chapels, I., 311.
Chaplains (private), II., 251.
Chapters, II., 253.
Chapters, Controversy of the Three, I., 434.
Chapters, division of the Holy Scripture by, II., 563.
Charisma, s. confirmatio, I., 292.
Charitable institutions, I., 519; II., 459.
Charity (Brothers of), III., 464.
Charlemagne, II., 106 sq., 124, 132.
Charlemagne is crowned Emperor, II., 109.
Charles, Duke of Sudermanland, III., 309.
Charles I., King of England, III., 335.
Charles IV., Emperor, III., 19.
Charles of Anjou, II., 429, 435.
Charles the Fat, II., 208.
Charles the Bald, II., 206.
Charles Martel, II., 38.
Charles V., III., 204, 232, 276, 279.
Charta charitatis, II., 490.
Chartres (School of), II., 265.
Chase (the), forbidden to ecclesiastics, II., 116.
Chateaubriand, III., 5; IV., 132 sq.
Châtel (John), IV., 65.
Châtel (F. Francis), IV., 167.
Chazari, II., 336.
Chemnitz, III., 401, 408, 412.
Chérier, I., 38.
Chieregati, III., 209 (note 2), 212.
Chiersy, or Crécy (Council of), II., 196, 308.
Children, III., 213.
Chili, IV., 343.
Chiliasm, I., 155, 241; II., 282.
Chillingworth, III., 415.
China (Propagation of Christianity in), I., 352; III., 468, 469; IV., 73, 323, sq.
Chinese, I., 52.
Choisy, Church Historian, I., 34.
Choirs of the Church. I., 313, 482.
Chorepiscopi. See *Country Bishops.*
Chosroes II., I., 349.
Christianity (causes of the rapid spread of), I., 175.
Christians (the), I., 123.
Christians obtain universal and absolute recognition of their religion, I., 197.
Χρίσμα, I., 292, 497.
Χριστοτόκος, I., 415.
Christ (doctrine of the Church on the divinity and humanity of), I., 107, 254.
Christiern II., King of Denmark, III., 313.
Christiern III., III., 314.
Christopher, III., 172.
Chrodegang, II., 117.
Chroniclers, I., 28.
Chronology, I., 20.
Chrysostom, I., 339, 382, 390, 459, 510, 521; II., 17; has recourse to Pope Innocent, I., 391.
Church (idea of a), I., 2; the Church established by Jesus Christ, I., 3, 108 sq.; the Catholic Church, I., 241, note 2; visible and invisible Church, I., 357.
Church, Greek, II., 137 sq., 322 sq., III., 84 sq.
Church, Lutheran, III., 228 sq.
Church, separation of the Church from the Synagogue, I., 133; the Church for the first time acknowledged as a lawful religious body, I., 191; interior division of church edifices, I., 480.
Church, the Catholic, exempted from taxes, I., 325; obtains the rights to accept donations and legacies, I., 325, 454, 461; II., 98, 255.
Church and State, I., 323, 330, 452; II., 97, 133, 183, 348, 382; III., 362.
Church property, II., 256.
Church Architecture, I., 480.
Church (Doctrine of the), its development, sources of it, I., 249 sq., 258 sq., 353, 354.
Church Historians, I., 24 sq., to 44.
Church History, I., 4 sq.; divisions of the same, I., 13; its value, I., 21.
Church Offices, I., 139, 270, 479.
Church Ornaments, I., 479; III., 164.
Church property (immunity of), II., 257.
Church (punishment inflicted by the), I., 298.
Church revenues (distribution of), I., 460.
Church-song, I., 147, 306, 485.
Church-song, German, III., 156.
Churches, celebrated, I., 480.
Churches, Gothic, III., 161.
Chytraeus, III., 309, 400, 409.
Cimabue, III., 168.
Circumcisionis festum, I., 491.
Circumcelliones, or Circelliones, I., 361.
Cistercians, II., 490; III., 173.

Clara (St.) of Assisi, and the nuns of her Order, II., 514.
Claudianus Mamertus, I., 486.
Claudianus, Emperor, I., 132.
Claudius of Turin, II., 160.
Clemangis (Nicholas de). See *Nicholas.*
Clement of Rome, I., 142, 282.
Clement (St.), of Alexandria, I., 204, 259, 261, 262, 321.
Clement (St.), first Bp. of Mentz, I., 173.
Clement II., Pope, II., 230.
Clement III., Pope, II., 414.
Clement IV., Pope, II., 429.
Clement V., Pope, III., 4.
Clement VI., Pope, III., 16.
Clement VII., Pope, III., 24, 215, 257, 316.
Clement VIII., Pope, III., 438.
Clement IX., Pope, IV., 5.
Clement X., Pope, IV., 6.
Clement XI., Pope, IV., 8.
Clement XII., Pope, IV., 10.
Clement XIII., Pope, IV., 12.
Clement XIV., Pope, IV., 13, 68.
Clement, Augustus, Archbishop of Cologne, IV., 206.
Clement, Flavius, I., 125.
Clement, an Irish heretical bishop, II., 127.
Clement (Jacques), III., 380.
Clementines, I., 151.
Clergy and Laity, I., 136.
Clerici et Fratres Vitæ Communis, III., 151.
Clergy, I., 136, 275; II., 116.
Clergy (Morals of the), II., 115, 464; III., 82.
Clergy (Education of the), I., 275, II., 117, 292.
Clergy (prohibitory laws restricting admission among the), I., 456, note 3; II., 99, note 1.
Clergy qualified to take their places in the diet of the empire, II., 97.
Clergy forbidden to become soldiers, to bear arms, or fight, II., 99.
Clerment (Synods of), II., 289, 371.
Cloisters. See *Monasticism.*
Cloisters produce the first architects, III., 164; picture of true cloistered life, II., 520; they are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of bishops, II., 248, 264.
Cloisters of women. See *Nunneries.*
Cloveshove (Council of), II., 273.
Clovis and Clotilda, II., 36.
Clugny (Congr. of), II., 216, 259, 271, 286.
Coadjutor bishops, II., 252.
Cobbett, III., 313; IV., 183.
Coccceius, IV., 89.
Cochem (Martin), IV., 58.
Cochin-China, IV., 321.
Cochlaeus, III., 193, 235, 474.
Code of Denys the Little, I., 478.
Code of Frederic II., II., 422.
Cœna—Bull In Cœna Domini, III., 436 442; IV., 13.
Colberg (See of), II., 180.
Collecta, I., 498.
Collegia pietatis, IV., 83.
Collegial (System of Pfaff), III., 397 IV., 80.
Collegiate Chapters, II., 253.
Collegiants, III., 414.
Collegium Germanicum, III., 444.
Collegium licitum, I., 195.
Collet, IV., 32.
Collyridians, I., 534.
Cologne (See of), II., 24, 80.
Cologne, Cathedral of, III., 165.
Cologne, Archbishopric, II., 266.
Cologne (Council of), II., 382.
Coloman, II., 80.
Columba (St.), II., 44.
Columbanus (St.), II., 75, 119.
Comboni, Vic. Ap., IV., 326.
Commendoni, Papal Legate, III., 299.
Community of goods among the firs Christians, I., 144.
Communicatio idiomatum, I., 414.
Communion, or the Eucharist, centre o all Christian Worship, I., 148, 301 497; II., 288; III., 151; controversy on the Eucharist, II., 309; Feast o Corpus Christi, III., 154; persons mus be fasting in order to receive the Eucharist, I., 507; and under *one* form I., 504; still communion under *both* forms is granted to the Hussites by the Council of Basle, III., 112; once more by Pius IV., III., 429.
Compromise, III., 440.
Compromise between the Dynamists and Modalists, I., 248.
Conception (Feast of the Immaculate) III., 154; controversy on the Immac Conception, II., 561; III., 486; declared a dogma, IV., 228.
Conceptualism, II., 533.
Conciliabulum of the Oak, I., 391.
Conclave, II., 434; III., 440.
Concomitantia, III., 153; especially in note *.
Concordance of the Bible, II., 564; III., 478.
Concordats, III., 40, 57.
Concordats of Princes, II., 57; IV., 136, 151, 153.

Concord (Formula and Book of), III., 409.
Concordia canonum, I., 479.
Concordia Vitebergensis, III., 259.
Concubinage of the Clergy, II., 116, 232, 236, 258, 270, 274, 465; III., 83.
Conductitii, II., 463.
Conference between the Christian Zacheus and the pagan philosopher, Apollonius, I., 346.
Confessio Augustana, III., 234.
Confessio Tetrapolitana, III., 239.
Confessio Helvetica, III., 261.
Confessio Anglicana, III., 330.
Confessio Belgica, III., 384.
Confessio fidei Tridentina, III., 433.
Confession, I., 296, 509; II., 570.
Confession, auricular, I., 296, 509.
Confession, public, I., 510.
Confessores, I., 208.
Confirmation, I., 144, 292, 497.
Confraternities, I., 456; II., 370.
Confucius, I., 52.
Confutatio Augustanæ Confessionis, III., 236.
Congregatio de auxliis, III., 439.
Congregatio de propaganda Fide, III., 441.
Congregatio Interpretum concilii, III., 434.
Congregatio Inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis, IV., 72.
Congruism, III., 484.
Conrad I., (King), II., 217.
Conrad II., (Emperor), II., 230.
Conrad III. (Emperor), II., 390.
Conrad IV. (King), II., 428.
Conrad, Bp. of Constance, II., 268.
Conrad of Marburg, II., 481.
Conradin, II., 428.
Consalvi, IV., 129, 136, 142, 149, 153.
Conscience (Examinations of), II., 120.
Consecration of bishops, I., 275.
Consensus repetitus ecclesiæ Lutheranæ, III., 411.
Consensus Patrum, I., 357.
Consensus Tigurinus, III., 290.
Consistories, Protestant, III., 395.
Consolamentum, II., 476.
Constance (See of), II., 73; Jesuits at, III., 452.
Constans I., I., 330.
Constans II., I., 447.
Constantine the Great, I., 322, 348, 526.
Constantine, Copronymus, II., 106, 153.
Constantine, Pogonatus, I., 448, 535; II., 103, 173.
Constantius, I., 330, 350, 378.
Constantinople, I., 327.
Constantinople, Patriarchate of, I., 427.
Constantinople, Conference of, I., 432.
Constitution of the Cath. Church, I., 270, 452.
Constitution of Lothaire, II., 186.
Constitution (civil) of the Clergy, IV., 117.
Constitution dogmatical de *Fide Catholica*, IV., 245,
Constitutum, I., 439; and *Judicatum*, " 437, of Pope Vigilius.
Contarini (Cardinal), III., 260, 478.
Conversions and Converts, III., 494; IV., 47, 264, 276.
Convulsionaries, IV., 23.
Copernicus, III., 479.
Copiatæ, I., 456; note 2.
Copts, I., 442.
Coran (the), II., 142 sq.
Corbie, II., 90, 162.
Corbinian, II., 79.
Cordova (School of), II., 302.
Cordova (Synod of), II., 280.
Corea, IV., 324.
Cornelius, Bp. of Rome, I., 190, 273.
Cornelius à Lapide, III., 479.
Corner, III., 480.
Coronation of Kings, II., 102, 246.
Coroticus, II., 42.
Corpus doctrinæ Prutenicum, III., 407.
Corpus Evangelicorum, IV., 79, 103.
Corpus Juris canonici, its origin and division, II., 458; III., 22; divers editions of it, I., 16, note 2.
Corpus Christi (Feast of), III., 153.
Correggio, III., 171.
Corsica, I., 341.
Cortesius (Paulus), III., 135.
Corrupticolæ, I., 431.
Corvey, II., 90.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, I., 351.
Coster, III., 476.
Cotelier, I., 33.
Cross, Congr. of the Holy, IV., 333.
Council (Prototype of a), I., 144.
Councils, Œcumenical; origin of this name and importance of Œcumenical Councils, I., 474.
I. Œcumenical C., 1st, of Nice, I., 365.
II. Œcumenical, 1st, of Constantinople, I., 383, 393.
III. Œcumenical, of Ephesus, I., 408.
IV. Œcumenical, of Chalcedon, I., 426.
V Œcumenical, 2nd, of Constantinople, I., 439.
VI. Œcumenical, 3rd, of Constantinople, I., 448.

VII. Œcumenical, 2nd, of Nice, II., 155.
VIII. Œcumenical, 4th, of Constantinople, II., 328.
IX. Œcumenical, 1st Lateran, II., 385.
X. Œcumenical, 2nd Lateran, II., 389.
XI. Œcumenical, 3rd Lateran, II., 407.
XII. Œcumenical, 4th Lateran, II., 418.
XIII. Œcumenical, 1st of Lyons, II., 427.
XIV. Œcumenical, 2nd of Lyons, II., 434.
XV. Œcumenical, at Vienne, III., 8.
Œcumenical, of Pisa, III., 28.
XVI. Œcumenical, of Constance, III., 32.
Œcumenical, of Basle, III., 43.
XVII. Œcumenical, of Ferrara-Florence, III., 84.
XVIII. Œcumenical, 5th Lateran, III., 72.
XIX. Œcumenical, of Trent, III., 421.
XX. Œcumenical, of the Vatican, IV., 233.
Acts of the Councils, I., 16, note 1.
Provincial Councils, I., 283.
Country bishops, I., 274, 456.
Courland turns Protestant, III., 302.
Court (the Roman), Supreme Court of Appeal, II., 454.
Court chaplains, II., 251.
Coustant, I., 33.
Covenant (the), III., 336.
Cracow (See of), II., 81.
Cranmer (Thomas), III., 318.
Cranz (Albert), I., 30.
Crécy, II., 308.
Crell (Chancellor), III., 339 409.
Crescent, I., 173; the Cynic, I., 184.
Crescentius, II., 222.
Croatians, II., 175.
Cromwell (Thomas), III., 319, 322.
Cromwell (Oliver), III., 338.
Crosier and Ring, I., 485; II., 244, 350, 384, 494.
Cross (image of the), I., 312, 318; form of the cross in churches, I., 482, it is carried away into Persia by Chosroes II., I., 350; abolition of the death penalty of the cross, I., 324; the cross adopted as a standard, I., 326; mysterious apparition of the cross, I., 335; sign of the cross, I., 318, note 2; exaltation of the holy cross, I., 493.
Crown, the triple of the Pope, II., 453.
Croyland (Abbey of), II., 275.
Crucifixion abolished, I., 324.
Crusades, II., 371; results of, II., 438.
Crypto-Calvinism, III., 407.
Culdees, II., 278.
Cullen (Paul), first Irish cardinal, IV., 226.
Culm (See of), II., 577.
Cultus, I., 147, 289, 479; II., 286.
Cultus of the Protestants, III., 397.
Cycle (the Dionysian), I., 20, note 1, 27.
Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage, I., 190, 205, 269, 272. 284, 293.
Cyril (St.), Bp. of Alexandria, I., 345, 416.
Cyril (St.), of Jerusalem, I., 380, 490, 499.
Cyril or Constantine, II., 174.
Cyril Lucaris, III., 510.
Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria, I., 444.
Czerski, IV., 311.

D.

D'Achéry Spicilegium, I., 33.
Dagobert, II., 37.
Dalberg (Theodor or Charles of), IV., 53, 145, 153.
D'Alembert, IV., 38.
Damasus I., Pope, I., 383.
Damasus II., Pope, II., 232.
Damian (St. Peter), II., 236, 237, 287, 296, 305.
Dancers, III., 174.
Dannenmayr, I., 37.
Dante, II., 516; III., 6, 134.
Danz, I., 41.
Darboy, IV., 251, 259.
Daub, IV., 351.
David of Dinanto, II., 483.
Deanery, II., 101, 253.
Deans and Priors in Monasteries, II., 33.
Deans and Provosts of Chapters, II., 464.
Deans and Provosts in Synodal Courts, II., 121.
Deacons, I., 142, 271; subordinate to Priests, I., 271.
Deaconesses, I., 142, note 3, 456; IV., 367.
Decius, Emperor, I., 188.
Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, IV., 17; of the Catholic Episcopacy in England, IV., 185.
Decretals of the Popes, I., 470, 478; false, II., 196 sq.
Decretals of Gregory IX., II., 424, 458, 460.
Decretals of Boniface VIII., II., 458.

Decretals of Clement V., III., 22.
Decrees of the Popes, I., 16, note 3.
Defenders, I., 456.
Definitores, II., 517.
Dei et apostolicæ sedis gratia, II., 454.
Deism, III., 418; IV., 129.
Delitzsch, IV., 354.
Delsignore, I., 36.
Deluge, I., 73.
Denina, IV., 43.
Denmark (Conversion of), II., 163.
Denmark, Protestantism in, III., 313.
Denunciatio evangelica, II., 459.
Denys the Areopagite and his writings, I., 396, note, 432; II., 285.
Denys, Bp. of Alexandria, I., 247, 295.
Denys the Little, I., 20, note 1, 478; II., 30, 66, 123.
Denys, Bp. of Milan, I., 376.
Denys (St.), Bp. of Paris, I., 169; II., 283, 537.
Denys, Bp. of Rome, I., 247.
Dereser (Thaddeus), IV., 285, note, 297.
Desiderius the Lombard, II., 106.
Desiderius of Monte Cassino, II., 367.
Dessau (Assembly of), III., 217.
Development of Jesus, I., 102.
Development of Ecclesiastical Science, I., 258, 356.
Development, Doctrinal. See *Doctrinal Development.*
Diderot, IV., 38.
Didier de la Cour, III., 457.
Didymus, I., 382, 396.
Diego, Bp. of Osma, II., 477, 508.
Dies Rogationum, I., 490.
Dies Stationum, I., 307.
Diet of Electors, III., 54.
Diet of Worms, III., 207, 260.
Diet of Nürnberg, III., 212, 215.
Diet of Spire, III., 230.
Diet of Augsburg, III., 193, 233.
Diet of Ratisbon, III., 260.
Dio of Prusa, I., 70.
Diocesan Synods, I., 284, 477; II., 100, 253; III., 444.
Dioclesian, I., 191.
Diodore of Tarsus, I., 382.
Diognete (letter to), I., 161, 317.
Dioscorus, I., 424.
Diospolis (Council of), I., 406.
Diplomatics, I., 19, note 2.
Diptychs, I., 502.
Discipline of the Secret, I., 304, 508.
Discipline, Ecclesiastical, I., 147; II., 121, 221.
Dissidents (Pro't in Poland), III., 418.
Dissidia theologica, I., 3.
Ditmar, Bp. of Merseburg, II., 266, 269.
Dobenek (James of), Bp. of Pomesania, III., 290.
Dobmayer, IV., 293.
Docetae, I., 158, especially 213.
Doctrinal Development, I., 249, 258, 353,
Dodwell, I., 43.
Doellinger, I., 38, 341; II., 138, 262.
Dogmas (Hist. of), I., 14, note 2, 353.
Dogmatics, Catholic, II., 526; III., 472; IV., 54, 294.
Dolcino, II., 485; his followers condemned, III., 10.
Dombrowka, II., 179.
Dominic (St.), II., 477, 508.
Dominic (Loricatus), II., 295.
Dominica in Albis, I., 489.
Dominicans, II., 508, 579.
Dominico Ghirlandajo, III., 168.
Domitian, Bp. of Ancyra, I., 435.
Domitian, Emperor, I., 132.
Domitilla, I., 131.
Donatello, III., 157.
Donation, pretended, of Constantine, III., 79.
Donatists, I., 359.
Donatus, I., 359.
Donatus, Bp. of Casænigræ, I., 359.
Dordrecht (Synod of), III., 386, 413.
Dorner, I., 254; IV., 347.
Dorpat (See of), II., 576.
Dorovernum, II., 48.
Dositheus, heresiarch of Samaria, I., 120, 152,
Douay Seminary for Catholic Englishmen, III., 332.
Drey, IV., 293,
Drontheim (See of), II., 168.
Druthmar, the Grammarian, Monk of Corvey, II., 299.
Ducreux, I., 34.
Ducrey (Martin), IV., 132.
Dungal, Monk of St. Denys, II., 160.
Dunin (Martin of), Archbishop of Posen, IV., 208.
Duns Scotus, II., 516, 559.
Dunstan (St.), Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 259, 275.
Dupanloup, IV., 241, 251.
Dupin, I., 33.
Dürer (Albert), III., 172.
Durand, I., 33.
Durand of St. Pourçain, III., 124.
Dynamics, I., 242.

E.

Easter, I., 147, 308, 489; controversy on the celebration of Easter, I., 309, 367; Councils held on this occasion, I., 310.

Easter Confession, II., 570.
Easter, communion at, II., 570.
East Indies, III., 466; IV., 74, 320 sq.
Ebbo, Archbp. of Rheims, II., 162, 189.
Ἑβδομάς μεγάλη, I., 489.
Ebionites, I., 151.
Eboracum. See *York.*
Eccehard, II., 267, 303.
Ecclesia cathedralis, I., 464; Matrix, ib. Plebana, ib.
Eck, III., 191, 192, 195, 203, 235, 237, 260.
Eckhart (Master), II., 437.
Economists, IV., 39.
Ecumenical. See *Councils.*
Ecumenical bishop. See *Episcopus universalis* or *Universal bishop.*
Edelmann, IV., 87.
Edessa (School of), I., 457.
Edict of Emperor Antoninus Pius to the Greek communities of Asia, I., 183.
Edict of Constantine at Milan, I., 197.
Edict (theological) of Emperor Justinian, I., 435, 436.
Edict of Justinus, I., 442.
Edict of Emperor Heraciius, I., 446.
Education of the Clergy. See *Clergy.*
Egbert, II., 70.
Egypt, I., 59, 61, 165; II., 147.
Eichhorn, IV., 89.
Eichstädt (See of), II., 87.
Einhard, II., 132, 601.
Ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως, I., 446.
Elbod, II., 70.
Election of bishops, I., 275, 462; the freedom of episcopal elections is gradually destroyed, I., 463; II., 98; determined struggle to re-establish it, II., 246, 368 sq.; participation of the community in episcopal elections, I., 275, 462; the election of bishops is confirmed by the Pope, II., 454 sq.
Elesbaan, I., 351.
Elevation, I., 503; III., 151.
Elias of Cortona, II., 517.
Eligius, Bp. of Noyon, II., 81.
Elipandus, Archbp. of Toledo, II., 129.
Elizabeth (St.), II., 586, coll. 589.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, III., 327 sq.
Elkesseans, I., 151.
Elvira (Council of), I., 313.
Emanations of the Gnostics, I., 212.
Emanations of the Hindoos, I., 54.
Emancipation of the Catholics in England, IV., 182.
Emancipation of slaves. See *Slavery.*
Embolismus, I., 503.
Emmeram (St.), II., 79.
Emmeric, II., 182.
Emperor; the share which the emperor had in episcopal elections, I., 463; II., 98; in the election of popes, II., 184, 218; is styled Vicarius Christi, II., 242.
Empire; the Holy Roman Empire is considered as the constitutional protector of the Church, II., 110; relation of the Empire to the papacy, II., 110; as a token of this relation the Emperor is ordained a cleric, II., 242; he sings the Gospel in the Mass celebrated by the Pope, III., 33; the symbolical Imperial globe, II., 222; the Empire and the papacy compared to two lights, to the matrimonial alliance, II., 412.
Empire (Latin), II., 417.
Ems (Punctuation of), IV., 52.
Emser (Jerome), III., 197, 474.
Encratites, I., 228.
Endura, II., 475.
Energumeni, I., 273, 499.
Enfantin, III., 169.
Engelhardt, I., 41.
England (Conversion of), II., 16 sq., 272; turns Protestant, III., 316 sq.; revival of Catholicity, IV., 178 sq., 265; Papal Legate in, II., 405.
Enlightenment, false, IV., 51.
Ἑνωτικόν, I., 429.
Eon d'Etoile (Eudo de Stella), II., 470.
Epaon (Council of), II., 73.
Eparchy, I., 464.
Ephesus (Robber Synod of), I., 425.
Ephraëm (St., the Syrian), I., 227, 382, 486, 521.
Epicureans, I., 65,
Ἐπίκλησις I., 497; III., 87.
Epiphanius (St., Bp. of Salamis), I., 382, 389, 390.
Epiphany (Feast of), I., 311, 490.
Episcopal system of the Catholics, III., 3, 80.
Episcopal system of the Protestants, III., 395; IV., 79.
Episcopius, III., 414 sq.
Episcopus universalis, I., 472.
Epistolæ obscurorum virorum, III., 141, 201.
Erasmus of Rotterdam, III., 137, 141, 272, 400.
Eric XIV., III., 307.
Erigena (John Scotus), II., 300, 308, 313, 316.
Erlau (See of), II., 182.
Ermeland (Varmia, See of), II., 577.
Ernesti (J. A.), IV., 89.

Erpenius (Thomas), III., 401.
Erwin of Steinbach, III., 166, note 4.
Eskyl, Archbp. of Lund, II., 395.
Espencaeus (Claudius), III., 375, 478.
Essenians, I., 88 sq.; divided into four classes, I., 151, note 3.
Esthonia (conversion of), II., 576.
Estius (William), III., 479.
Ἑτεροούσιος, I., 377.
Ethelbert, King of Kent, II., 48.
Ethelwold, Bp. of Winchester, II., 275.
Etherius, Bp. of Osma, II., 130.
Eucharist. See *Communion.*
Eucharistic bread, I., 147, 498; II., 289.
Eucharius, 1st Bp. of Treves, I., 173.
Euchites or Euphemites, I., 532.
Eudoxia, I., 390.
Eugene II., Pope, II., 186.
Eugene III., Pope, II., 391.
Eugene IV., Pope, III., 43.
Eugene, Bp. of Carthage, II., 22.
Eulogius, Bp. of Cæsarea, I., 406.
Eunomius, Bp. of Cyzicus, I., 377.
Eunapius, Bp. of Sardes, I., 343.
Euric, King of the Visigoths, II., 19.
Eusebians, I., 377.
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea, I., 25, 345, 365, 376, 388, 395.
Eusebius, Bp. of Dorylaeum, I., 424.
Eusebius, Bp. of Emesa, I., 395.
Eusebius, Bp. of Nicomedia, I., 365, 370.
Eusebius, Bp. of Vercelli, I., 376; II., 30.
Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, I., 366, 370.
Eustathius, Bp. of Sebaste, I., 528, 533.
Eutyches, I., 423.
Eutychius, Patr. of Alexandria, I., 31, note.
Euthymius, Monk, I., 351.
Euthymius, Zigabenus, II., 334, 582.
Evagrius, I., 26.
Evodius, Bp. of Antioch, I., 126, note 1.
Exarchate, I., 466.
Exarchs, I., 465.
Excommunication, I., 148, 295, 512.
Excommunicatio major et minor, I., 512; II., 296.
Excommunicated persons prosecuted by the State, II., 122.
Exegesis, allegorical, I., 212, 263 sq., 265.
Exegesis, grammatical and historical, I., 265. See also *Holy Scriptures.*
Exemptions, II., 122.
Exorcism and exorcists, I., 274, 456; among Protestants, III., 399.
Extravagantes, III., 22.
Extreme Unction, I., 147, 517; II., 288.
Eybel (Valentine), IV., 16, 51.
Eyck (Van, Hubert, and John), III., 172.

F.

Faber, Jesuit, III., 447.
Faber of Constance, III., 246.
Faber, F. W., the Engl. Oratorian, IV., 270.
Fabian, Bp. of Rome, I., 168, 190.
Fabre, Jean Claude, the Fr. Orat., I., 34.
Facundus of Hermiane, I., 437.
Faith and Science, I., 263, 394, 527; II., 297, 531, 539.
Farel (William), III., 282.
Farther India, IV., 74, 321.
Fasts, I., 148, 307.
Fasting (Days of), I., 493.
Fatalism, I., 62; II., 143; III., 250; IV., 352.
Fathers of the Christian Doctrine, III., 461.
Faustus, Bp. of Riez, I., 410.
Fé Sta., IV., 328; de Bogota, III., 105.
Feasts of Christ; idea of them; eccl. feasts, I., 306, 488; the life of a Christian a perpetual feast, I., 148, 306; III., 150.
Febronius, IV., 49.
Fécamp (Abbey and School of), II., 265.
Fecht (Peter), III., 309.
Feilmoser, IV., 296.
Felicissimus, I., 300.
Felix of Aptunga, I., 358.
Felix of Urgel, II., 129.
Felix of Valois, II., 500.
Felix III., Pope, I., 430.
Felix V., Pope, III., 54.
Fénélon, IV., 21, 30, 34
Ferrandus (Fulgentius), I., 433, 436.
Ferrara (Council of), III., 85.
Fesch (Cardinal), IV., 133, 140, 145.
Festum Annunciationis, B. M. V., I., 492; II., 284.
Festum Assumptionis, II., 284.
Festum Exaltationis sanctæ crucis, I., 493.
Festum Innocentium, I., 492.
Festum Nativitatis, II., 284.
Festum Omnium sanctorum, I., 492.
Festum Petri et Pauli, I., 492.
Festum Præsentationis, I., 492; II., 284.
Festum Purificationis, B. M. V., I., 492.
Feudalism, II., 97, 244.
Feuerbach (latest phase of Protestant theology), IV., 353.
Fèvre (Jacques le), III., 142.
Fiesole (Angelico), III., 168.
Filioque, I., 386; II., 325.

Fire (philosophy of), III., 404.
Firmicus Maternus, I., 346.
Firmilian, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, I., 294.
First-fruits, II., 466.
Fisher, Bp. of Worcester, III., 138, 320.
Flacius (Matt.), the Illyrian, I., 32; III., 276, 400, 405.
Flagellants, III., 173 sq.
Flavian of Antioch, I., 383.
Flavian of Constantinople, I., 424.
Flavius Josephus, I., 85.
Fléchier, IV., 34.
Fleury, I., 33.
Flodoard, I., 28; II., 304.
Florence (Council of), III., 84.
Florence (Synod of), II., 231.
Flores martyrum, I., 311.
Florez, IV., 45.
Florus (Master of Lyons), II., 308.
Flotte (Peter), II., 445.
Fo, I., 51.
Fonseca, *Scientia Dei media*, III., 486.
Fontevrault (Order of), II., 498.
Fools (Feast of), II., 570.
Formosus, Pope, II., 210.
Fossores, I., 456.
Foundling houses, II., 459.
Fox (George), IV., 95 sq.
Fra Bartolomeo, III., 169.
Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole, III., 169.
France (efforts of Protestantism to spread in), III., 373 sq.
Francesco Francia, III., 170.
Francis Apulus, III., 117.
Francis of Assisi, II., 510, 579.
Francis of Paula, III., 150.
Francis of Sales, III., 459.
Francis Xavier, III., 466.
Franciscans, II., 510, 517, 579 sq.; IV., 332.
Franco, III., 172.
Franke (August Herman), IV., 83.
Frankenberg (Cardinal), IV., 52.
Frankfort (Council of), II., 131, 178, 268.
Frankfort (Diets of Princes), III., 56.
Frankfort (Diets of Electors), III., 16, 56.
Frankish Empire (religious condition of the F. Empire), during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, II., 264.
Franks (the), II., 36.
Fratres conventuales, III., 169.
Fratres minores, II., 514.
Fratres de communitate, III., 152.
Fratres regularis observantiæ, III., 152.
Fratricelli, or Beghards, III., 10.
Frayssinous, IV., 162.
Frederic I., II., 393 sq.
Frederic II., II., 413.
Frederic III., III., 54.
Frederic the Wise, Prince Elector, III., 190.
Frederic I. of Prussia IV., 51.
Frederic William II. of Prussia, IV., 347.
Frederic William III., IV., 204, 347, 364.
Frederic William IV., IV., 209, 364.
Freemasonry, IV., 11, 59, 155 sq.
Freethinkers, IV., 36, 59, note.
Freisingen (See of), II., 79, 87.
Fretella, II., 18.
Friday (day of fasting), I., 307.
Fridolin, II., 74.
Frint, IV., 292.
Frisians (Conversion of the), II., 81.
Fritzsche, IV., 354.
Fritzlar (See of), II., 87.
Fructuosus, Bp. of Braga, II., 118.
Fructus medii temporis, III., 22.
Frumentius, Bp. of Abyssinia, I., 351.
Fulbert of Chartres, II., 305.
Fulco of Neuilly, II., 417; III., 157.
Fulda (Monastery of), II., 89.
Fulda (School of), II., 126.
Fulgentius (Bp. of Ruspe), I., 411, II., 22.
Fulness of Time for the coming of Christ, I., 90.
Fullo (Peter), I., 430.
Functions, ecclesiastical, I., 139, 271, 455.
Funeral orations, I., 518.
Fünfkirchen (See of), II., 182.

G.

Gabriel (Pro-magister), III., 193.
Gaëtano of Thiene, III., 456.
Gailer of Kaisersberg, III., 78, 158.
Galilei, III., 479.
Galland, St. Gall, II., 76, 126, 303.
Gallandi, IV., 44.
Gallerius, I., 192.
Gallican liberties, IV., 17.
Gaul (Propagation of Christianity in), I., 166 sq., II., 19.
Gamaliel, I., 87, 329.
Gangra (Synod of), I., 459, 533.
Garibald, II., 78.
Garnet, Jesuit, III., 333.
Garnier, I., 33, 399.
Gassner, IV., 59.
Gaunilo, Monk, II., 532.
Gazette of Augsburg, IV., 241.
Gazzaniga, IV., 57.

Gebhard, Prince, Elector of Cologne, III., 499.
Gebhard of Constance, II., 370.
Geisa, II., 181.
Geiseric, I., 352; II., 21.
Geissel, Archbp. of Cologne, II., 80, note; Cardinal, IV., 225, 286.
Gelasius II., II., 383.
Gemara, 1., 178.
Gemistius Pletho, III., 135.
General (Seminaries), IV., 51.
General (Vicars), II., 464.
Generationism, I., 400.
Gennadius, I., 410.
Genseric, I., 352, II., 21.
Gentilis, III., 284.
Genuflectentes, I., 298.
Geography (Ecclesiastical), I., 19.
George, Duke of Saxony, III., 197, 206, 218.
Georgia, I., 350 (Iberia).
Gerard (the Franciscan), II., 518 sq.
Gerard John, III., 402.
Gerard, Paul, III., 402.
Gerard, Bp. of Toul, II., 268.
Gerard (Segarelli). See *Segarelli.*
Gerbert, II., 225, 305 316; Abbot, IV., 57.
Gerbet, IV., 215.
German hymn-books, III., 156, 480.
Germans (Religion of the), II., 11; introduction of Christianity among them, II., 16 sq., 71 sq.; peculiar situation of the Church among them, II., 92 sq.; their scientific efforts and first results thereof, II., 126.
German theology, heretical, III., 113; orthodox by Berthold, Bp. of Chiemsee, III., 474.
Germanus (St.), Bp. of Auxerre, II., 11.
Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, II., 153.
Gerson, III., 26, 29, 35, 131.
Gerstungen (Council of), II., 365.
Gfrörer, I., 42.
Ghibellines and Guelfs, II., 413.
Ghiberti of Florence, III., 167.
Gieseler, I., 41, 284; II., 465; III., 239.
Giftschütz, IV., 57.
Gilbert de la Porrée, II., 540; III., 157.
Gilimer, II., 22.
Giotto, III., 168.
Girardus, II., 339.
Giunta of Pisa, III., 168.
Glass (staining), III., 165.
Glassius (Solomon), III., 401.
Glastonbury, II., 275.
Globe (The imperial), II., 222, 255.
Gnesen (Archbishopric of), II., 180.
Gnosis (False), I., 142, 209.
Gnosis (True), I., 258.
Gnosticism, I., 210; Egyptian, I., 215; Syrian, I., 226; Ebionite, I., 230.
Goa, Schism of, IV., 321.
Goar (St.), Hermit, II., 79.
Goch (John de), III., 116.
God (Cath. doctrine on), I., 253.
Godeau, Bp. of Venice, I., 33.
Godehard, Bp. of Hildesheim, II., 268.
Godfathers and Godmothers, I., 291.
Godfrey of Bordeaux, III., 157.
Godfrey of Bouillon, II., 377.
Godfrey of Lukina, II., 577.
Godfrey of Strasburg, II., 565.
Godfrey of Vendôme, II., 384.
Godomar, II., 24.
Goffine, IV., 57.
Golius, III., 402.
Gomarus, III., 412.
Gonzalez, Thyrsus, IV., 45.
Görres, I., 285, note 1; II., 525; IV., 300.
Göthe, IV., 93.
Gother, IV., 183.
Goths, II., 16.
Gottschalk, II., 178, 306.
Grabe, I., 43.
Grace (Cath. doctrine and controversy on), I., 399; II., 306, 560; III., 481; IV., 22.
Grammont (Order of), II., 492.
Gran (Archbishopric of), II., 182.
Granvella (Cardinal), III., 383, 482.
Gratian (Decretum of), II., 458.
Gratius (Ortwin), III., 140.
Graveson, I., 35.
Greek (Church), II., 137, 322, 582; reunites with the Catholic Church, III., 88.
Greek learning, II., 581.
Greeks (Religion and Morals of the Pagan), I., 61.
Greenland (Discovery and Conversion of), II., 169, 516; IV., 102.
Gregorian Chant, I., 488.
Gregory, Bp. of Elvira, I., 379.
Gregory, Bp., the Illuminator, I., 350.
Gregory, Bp. of Nazianzum, I., 346, 383, 387, 457, 475, 487.
Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa, I., 382, 394, 510, 512.
Gregory, Bp. "Thaumaturgus," I., 265.
Gregory, Bp. of Tours, I., 28; II., 37.
Gregory of Utrecht, II., 88.
Gregory of Cyprus, II., 155.
Gregory of Heimburg, III., 57.
Gregory (St.), the Great, Pope, I., 460, 472, 487; II., 27, 46, 34.

Gregory (St.) II., Pope, II., 84, 102, 152.
Gregory (St.), III., Pope, II., 85, 102, 152.
Gregory IV., Pope, II., 164, 188 sq.
Gregory V., Pope, II., 224.
Gregory VI., Pope, II., 229.
Gregory (St.), VII., Pope, II., 321, 346 sq.
Gregory VIII., Pope, II., 383, 409.
Gregory IX., Pope, II., 422 sq.
Gregory X., Pope, II., 433 sq.
Gregory XI., Pope, III., 21.
Gregory XII., Pope, III., 27.
Gregory XIII., Pope, III., 378, 437.
Gregory XIV., Pope, III., 438.
Gregory XV., Pope, III., 440.
Gregory XVI., Pope, IV., 157 sq.
Groot (Gerard), III., 150.
Gropper, III., 260, 474.
Grotius (Hugo), III., 401, 413, 497; IV., 89.
Gruet, III., 284.
Guadalaxara, IV., 340.
Gualbert, John (Congregation of), II., 263.
Guardian, II., 515.
Guericke, I., 41; IV., 354, 361, 385.
Guiana, IV., 343.
Guibert of Nogent, III., 159.
Guibert, Abbot of Gemblours, II., 520.
Guibert, Bp. of Ravenna, Antipope, II., 364.
Guido, Archbishop of Milan, II., 272.
Guido Reni, III., 488.
Guido of Siena, III., 168.
Guido of Arezzo, III., 174.
Guigo (Prior), II., 493.
Guilds, II., 460.
Guitmund, II., 526, note 1.
Γυναικες συνεἰσακτοι, I., 402. Cfr. II., 465.
Gundebald, II., 23.
Guntamund, II., 22.
Günther (Anthony), of Vienna, IV., 294, 304.
Gustavus Adolphus, III., 502.
Gustavus Vasa, III., 305.
Guyon (Joane), IV., 48 sq.
Gyrovagi, I., 528.

H.

Hadeby (School of), II., 163.
Hacon the Good, II., 167.
Hadrian, Emperor, I., 182.
Hadrian I., Pope, II., 107.
Hadrian II., Pope, II., 181, 204, 328.
Hadrian IV., Pope, II., 393 sq.; his bull concerning Ireland, II., 398 sq.
Hadrian V., Pope, II., 435.
Hadrian VI., Pope, III., 211 sq.
Half Fast-days, I., 306.
Halberstadt (See of), II., 90.
Hales (Alexander) II., 550.
Halifax, IV., 328.
Halitgar, Archbishop of Cambrai, II., 120, 300.
Haligar, Monk, II., 163.
Hamburg (Archbishopric of), II., 164.
Hamburg-Bremen, II., 163.
Hamel, IV., 32.
Hammer (See of), II., 168.
Hands (Imposition of), I., 138, 145, 292.
Hanno (St.), Archbishop of Cologne, II., 239, 347.
Harold Haarfagr, II., 168.
Harold Blaatand, II., 166.
Harold the Dane, II., 163 sq.
Harduin, I., 16, note; IV., 34, 81.
Harless, IV., 361.
Harms (Nicholas), IV., 360.
Hase, I., 41; IV., 385.
Havelberg (See of), II., 178.
Haymo (Bp. of Halberstadt), I., 28; II., 126, 299.
Hayti, IV., 342.
Hebrew (Study of), III., 138, 139.
Hedwige (St.), Queen of Poland, III., 175.
Hefele, I., 38; II., 303; III., 3; IV., 298.
Hegel, IV., 351.
Hegesippus, I., 24.
Hégira, II., 141.
Heidelberg (Catechism of), III., 412.
Helding (Michael), III., 276.
Helena, I., 320, 480.
Heliogabalus, I., 186.
Helladius of Toledo, II., 20.
Helsen, Abbé, IV., 189.
Helvetia, II., 72.
Helvetius, IV., 39.
Helvidius, I., 534.
Heming (St.), Archbishop of Upsala, III., 176.
Hemling, Hans, III., 171.
Hengstenberg, IV., 354, 362.
Henke, I., 40.
Henning Brabant, III., 399.
Hennuyer (John of Lisieux), III., 379.
Henriciani, II. See *Petrobrusians.* II., 469.
Henry I., II., 218.
Henry II., II., 228.
Henry III., II., 233.
Henry IV., II., 237, 241, 347 sq.
Henry V., II., 380.
Henry VI., II., 407.
Henry VII., III., 5.

Henry VIII., King of England, III., 223, 316.
Henry, Duke of Brunswick, IV., 175.
Henry, Archbishop of Gnesen, II., 415.
Henry, Monk of Lausanne, II., 469.
Henry, Apostle of the Finlanders, II., 167.
Henry of Langenstein, III., 25.
Heptarchy, II., 46.
Heraclius, I., 350, 444 sq.
Herbert (Count), IV., 36.
Herbst (Jesuit), III., 307.
Herder, II., 2, 29; IV., 92.
Heresy, its import, I., 3, 250, note 2.
Heresy, its advantage, I., 250.
Heretics, the first, I., 150.
Heretics, their condemnation to death, II., 340; first instance of this kind, I., 531; reasons for such proceedings in the M. A., II., 480; but examples of the same nature among Protestants, III., 284, 394; which are not justified by the same motive, III., 122.
Heretics (Controversy on the validity of the baptism of), I., 292.
Heribert, Heresiarch, II., 340.
Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, II., 340.
Herlembald, II., 270.
Herlen, Frederic, III., 171.
Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, III., 267, 276.
Herman Contractus, I., 29; II., 305.
Herman, Bp. of Metz, II., 357.
Herman of Salza, Grand Master, II., 365.
Herman, Archbishop of Freiburg, IV., 280 sq.
Hermas, I., 131, 160.
Hermengild, II., 20.
Hermes, IV., 293, 302 sq.
Hermias, Apologist, I., 205.
Hermits, I., 315, 525.
Hermogenes, I., 225.
Herod the Great, I., 83, 133.
Herod Antipas, I., 133.
Herod Antipater, I., 83.
Herod Agrippa, I., 122, 133.
Heroism of the Christians, I., 206 sq., 317; II., 280.
Herrnhutters, IV., 94 sq.
Hessels (John and Leonard), III., 482.
Hesshusius, III., 407.
Hessia (Conversion of), II., 87.
Hesychasts, II., 582.
Hetzer, III., 246.
Hieracas, Gnostic, I., 241.
Hierarchy, I., 6, 139 sq.
Hierocles, I., 201, 343.
Hieronymites, III., 149.
Hierotheus, Monk, II., 181.
Hilarion (St.), I., 527.
Hilary (St.) of Arles, I., 473; II., 25.
Hilary (St.) of Poitiers, I., 376, 380, 383, 457.
Hilary the layman, I., 410.
Hilda, Abbess, II., 67.
Hildebert, Bp. of Mans, II., 383, 470, 535; III., 157.
Hildebrand, Monk, II., 231, 233, 320.
Hildegard (St.), II., 468, 549.
Hildesheim (See of), II., 90.
Hildesheim (School of), II., 268, 306.
Hildesheim (Introduction of Protestantism in), III., 267.
Hincmar of Rheims, II., 160, 197, 256, 301, 308.
Hincmar of Laon, II., 206.
Hindoos, I., 53.
Hippo (Synod of), I., 508.
Hippolytus, I., 245.
Hirschau (Congr. of), II., 126, 260, 302.
Hirscher, IV., 295.
History (Importance, division, and exposition of), I., 4 sq.
Hock, II., 303; IV., 302.
Hofbauer, IV., 199.
Hogstraaten, III., 141, 191.
Hohenstaufen, II., 393 sq.
Holbein, III., 171, 488.
Holden (H.), III., 496.
Holland, III., 382 sq.; IV., 187, 263.
Holy Ghost (Descent of the), I., 117 sq.
Holy Ghost (Cath. doctrine on the), I., 256; II., 325; controversy on, I., 384 sq.; II., 325.
Holy Scriptures; relation of the Holy Scriptures to tradition, I., 253.
Holy Scriptures (interpretation of the), I., 253, 355; III., 424.
Holy Scriptures (translations of the). See *Translations.*
Holy Seasons. See *Seasons.*
Holzhauser, Bartholomew, III., 445.
Homage, II., 244, 371, 385.
Homerites, I., 351.
Homes for the Aged, II., 460.
Homiliarium, II., 118, 265, 289.
Honorius I., Pope, I., 443 sq.
Honorius II., Pope, II., 240, 387.
Honorius III., Pope, II., 424, 510.
Honorius IV., Pope, II., 437.
Honorius, Emperor, I., 340, 407.
Hontheim, I., 37; IV., 49.
Hormisdas, I., 431.
Hortig, I., 37.
Hosius (of Cordova), I., 365, 377.
Hosius (Stanislaus), III., 300, 308, 429, 474.

Hospices, free, for strangers, II., 460.
Hospitalers, II., 503.
Hospitals, II., 460.
Hospitia Scotorum, II., 278.
Hottinger (Henry), I., 41.
Hroswitha, II., 304; III., 133.
Huesca (Synod of), I., 407.
Huet, Bp. of Avranches, IV., 32.
Hug, I., 330 (note 1); IV., 296.
Hugh Capet, II., 224.
Hugh a St. Caro, II., 563.
Hugh, Monk of Fleury, II., 385.
Hugh Grotius, III. See *Grotius.*
Hugh of Sens, II., 543.
Hugh of St. Victor, II., 544, 549, 562.
Huguenots in France, III., 373, note 4.
Humanists, III., 136, 191.
Humbert of Romon, III., 158.
Hume, IV., 37.
Humiliati, or the Humbled, II., 501.
Hunerich, I., 352; II., 22.
Hungary (Christianity in), II., 181.
Hungary (Protestantism in), III., 302.
Hungary (National Council of), IV., 199.
Huns, II., 24.
Huss (John), III., 100 sq.; his death, III., 106; there was no violation of safe-conduct in his regard, III., 106.
Hussites, III., 110; III., 198, 296.
Hussites (the four Articles of the), III., 112.
Hutten (Ulrich), III., 142, 200.
Hutter (Leonard), III., 411.
Hy (Monastery on the island of), II., 45.
Hydroparastatæ, I., 228.
Hyginus, Bp. of Cordova, I., 530.
Hymenæus, I., 143.
Hymn-books, German, III., 159, 480.
Hymns of the Church, I., 147, 305, 487; III., 156.
Hypatia, I., 340, 343.
Hypsistarians, I., 536, note 2.

I.

Ibas of Edessa, I., 423, 425, 435.
Iberia. See *Georgia,* I., 350.
Iceland (Conversion of), II., 170; Protestant, III., 191.
Ichthyophagi, II., 138.
Iconium (Synod of), I., 293.
Iconoclasts, II., 153.
Idolatry, forbidden, I., 338; II., 120.
Ignatius of Antioch, I., 160, 271, 280 (note 2), 282, 318.
Ignatius, Patr. of Constantinople, II., 323, 328.
Ignatius of Loyola, III., 446.
Ildephonse, Archbishop of Toledo, II., 20, 123.
Illuminati (Order of the), IV., 59.
Images, I., 312, 484; III., 166 sq.
Images (Controversy on), in the East, II., 149; in the Frankish Empire, II., 159.
Immunities of Clergy, II., 98, 256, 459.
Imperium mundi of the Emperor of the West, II., 110.
Imposition of hands, I., 138, 145, 292.
Impostores, tres. II., 426, note 1.
Ina (King), II., 60.
Incarnation (Heresy on the dogma of the), I., 414 sq., 423 sq., 428.
Incense burned at the altar, I., 499.
Independents, III., 338.
India (Hither), I., 53, 351; IV., 320; (Farther), IV., 321.
Indians. See *Hindoos.*
Indifferentism, I., 447; IV., 279, 382.
Indigent (Hospitals for the), II., 460.
Indigent (Schools for the), II., 30.
Indulgences, I., 299, 514; II., 296, 572; III., 137, 188, 194, 433; IV., 72.
Indulgences for the faithful departed, II., 573.
Infallibility (Papal), IV., 245.
Infant asylums, II., 460.
Infralapsarii, III., 412.
Ingolstadt, III., 452.
Innocent I., Pope, I., 390, 406.
Innocent II., Pope, II., 388, 492.
Innocent III., Pope, II., 412, 465, 477.
Innocent IV., Pope, II., 427, 579.
Innocent V., Pope, II., 435.
Innocent VI., Pope, III., 13.
Innocent VII., Pope, III., 27.
Innocent VIII.; Pope, III., 65.
Innocent IX., Pope, III., 438.
Innocent X., Pope, III., 441; IV., 3.
Innocent XI., Pope, IV., 6.
Innocent XII., Pope, IV., 7.
Innocent XIII., Pope, IV., 9.
Inquisition (Ecclesiastical), II., 481; III., 119.
Inquisition (Spanish), III., 122.
Inquisitores hæreticæ pravitatis, II., 120 (note 1); IV., 72.
Inscriptions, I., 18, note 2.
Inscription of Autun, I., 303.
Inspiration, I., 355, 565; III., 477.
Interdict, II., 265, 294, 571.
Interim of Ratisbon, III., 261.
Interim of Augsburg, III., 276.
Interim of Leipsig, III., 277.
Introitus, I., 498.
Investitures (Controversy on), II., 350, 375, 380; works on this subject, II., 346 (note 1), 377 (note 2.)

Iona (Island of), II., 44.
Irenaeus (St.) Bp. of Lyons, I., 167, 253, 281, 284, 304.
Irene (Empress), II., 156.
Ireland (Conversion of), II., 39, 276.
Ireland (Island of Saints), II., 43.
Ireland (Attempts to Protestantize), III., 347 sq.
Ireland remains Catholic, IV., 186.
Ireland (her present situation), IV., 272 sq.
Irvingites, IV., 376.
Isenbiehl, IV., 59.
Isidore (St.) of Pelusium, I., 420.
Isidore (St.) Archbishop of Seville, I., 478, II., 20, 120, 124, 196.
Isidore (Pseudo), II., 193.
Islam, II., 143.
Isochristoi, I., 436.
Israelites (The) I., 72.
Isserinus, Bp., II., 41.
Itala, I., 355.
Italy, II., 269.
Ithacius of Ossonuba, I., 530.
Ivo or Yves of Chartress, II., 381; III., 157.

J.

Jaballah, I., 351.
Jablonski, I., 43.
Jacobellus, III., 109.
Jacobi, IV., 350.
Jacobites, I., 443.
Jacopona, author of the *Stabat Mater*, III., 156.
Jagello, III., 175.
Jäger, I., 34.
Jahn, IV., 496.
Jamblicus, I., 341.
James the Elder, beheaded, I., 122.
James the Younger, son of Alpheus, brother of the Lord, first Bishop of Jerusalem, I., 128.
James Baradai. See *Baradai*.
James de'Laderchi, I., 33.
James de Voragine, II., 569.
James Zanzalus, I., 443,.
Jansenius (Cornelius), Bishop of Ghent, III., 478.
Jansenius (Cornelius), Bishop of Ypres, and author of the "*Augustinus*," III., 485, IV., 19 sq.
Japan, III., 467, IV., 324.
Jarcke, IV., 276, 292.
Jeremiah II., Patriarch of Constantinople, III., 510.
Jerome (St.), I., 339, 383, 396, 406, 458, 471, 533.
Jerome of Prague, III., 108.
Jerusalem (Destruction of), I., 133; an event most important for the success and spread of the Christian Church, I., 134.
Jerusalem (Council of), I., 144.
Jerusalem (audacious but vain efforts of the Emperor Julian to rebuild the temple of), I., 336.
Jerusalem conquered by Chosroës II., I., 350.
Jerusalem conquered by Saladin, II., 409.
Jerusalem (Synod of), I., 406.
Jerusalem (Dignity of the Patriarch in the Church of), I., 467, IV., 225.
Jesuits (Order of), III., 149.
Jesuits (Foundation of the Order of), its constitution and object, III., 447 sq.; they cannot be commanded to commit a sin, III., 449, note 2; their labours, III., 300, 303, 451, 485; suppression, IV., 63, and restoration of the Jesuits, IV., 149; Jesuit Colleges in America, IV., 150.
Jesus Christ, I., 98, 106.
Jews (Religious and political history of the), I., 72 sq.; they obtain privileges from Julian the Apostate, I., 336.
Jews (Conversion of), III., 179.
Jews (Persecution of), III., 145, 176.
Jezdedsherd, I., 349.
Joachim of Floris, II., 486, 518.
Joachim I. of Brandenburg, Catholic, III., 240.
Joachim II., Protestant, III., 259.
Joane, pretended female Pope, II., 192.
Joasaph II., Patriarch of Constantinople, III., 87.
Johannites, II., 503.
John (St.) Baptist, I., 103.
John (St.), his feast, I., 493.
John (St., the Evangelist), I., 129, 132, 157.
John I., Pope, II., 26.
John II., Pope, I., 433.
John IV., Pope, I., 445.
John VIII., Pope, II., 207, 330.
John IX., Pope, II., 176, 212.
John X., Pope, II., 213.
John XI., Pope, II., 214.
John XII., Pope, II., 215.
John XIII., Pope, II., 177, 221.
John XIV., Pope, II., 223.
John XV., Pope, II., 223.
John XVI., Pope, II., 224.
John XVII., Pope, II., 226.
John XVIII., Pope, II., 226.
John XIX., Pope, II., 228.

John XXI., Pope, II., 436.
John XXII., Pope, III., 11.
John XXIII., Pope, III., 31.
John III., King of Sweden, III., 307.
John of Antioch, I., 422.
John of Avila, III., 481.
John Braske, Bp. of Linköping, III., 305.
John Buridan, III., 125.
John Capistrano, III., 158.
John Cassian, I., 410.
John Columbino, III., 149.
John, Constant (the), III., 230.
John, Cross (of the), III., 459.
John Damascene, I., 451; II., 153, 311, 546.
John, Falkenberg (of), III., 42.
John, Faster (the), I., 466, 472.
John of Fidanza, III., 552.
John Frederic, the Magnanimous, III., 266.
John of St. Giles, II., 516.
John of Gishala, I., 134.
John van Goch, III., 116.
John of God, III., 462.
John the Grammarian, II., 158.
John Gaulbert, II., 263.
John of Jandun, III., 12.
John of Jerusalem, I., 401.
John, Knights of St. John, II., 503.
John of Leyden, III., 263.
John, Archbp. of Lyons, II., 381.
John Magnus Gothus, III., 305.
John de Matha, II., 500.
John of Mecklenburg, II., 179.
John the Monk, II., 449.
John of Monte Corvino, II., 579.
John of Oliva, II., 518.
John, Bp. of Pavia, II., 208.
John Philoponus, I., 432.
John Polemar, III., 44.
John of Ragusa, III., 44.
John, Archbp. of Ravenna, II., 202, 269.
John of Salisbury, II., 546.
John the Scolastic, I., 477.
John, Archbp. of Taranto, III., 49.
John Tolemei, III., 150.
John of Tritenheim, I., 210.
John Turrecremata, III., 55.
John of Vicenza, III., 157.
Jonas, Bp. of Orleans, II., 160.
Jordan, Bp. of Posen, II., 179.
Jornandes, II., 122.
Josaphat II. of Constantinople, III., 83.
Joseph II., IV., 14, 50, 52, 104.
Joseph of Arimathea, I., 114.
Journalism (Catholic) in North America, IV., 336.
Journalism (Catholic) in Belgium, IV., 262.
Journalism (Catholic) in England, IV., 270.
Journalism (Catholic) in France, IV., 261.
Journalism (Catholic) in Germany, IV., 300.
Journalism (Catholic) in Holland, IV., 264.
Journalism (Catholic) in Italy, IV., 224.
Journalism (Catholic) in Portugal, IV., 253.
Journalism (Catholic) in Spain, IV., 254.
Jovain (Emperor), I., 280.
Jovinian (Monk), I., 533.
Jubilee (year of), II., 572.
Judaizing (Christians), I., 150.
Judas Maccabeus, II., 84.
Judas the Apostle, I., 110.
Judicatum of Pope Vigilius, I., 437.
Julian the Apostate, I., 332.
Julian of Eclanum, I., 407.
Julian of Halicarnassus, I., 431.
Julianists, I., 360.
Julin (See of), II. See *Wollin.*
Julius I., Pope, I., 473.
Julius II., Pope, III., 74.
Julius III., Pope,, III., 426.
Jura dominicalia, II., 461.
Jurisdiction of the Clergy, I., 324, II., 256.
Jus canonicum, II., 457, III., 22.
Jus circa sacra, I., 463, note 3.
Jus Primarum precum, II., 458.
Jus spolii et regalium, II., 255, 459, 467.
Jus stolæ, II., 254.
Justin (St.) Martyr, I., 184, 203, 316.
Justin I. (Emperor), I., 430.
Justin II. (Emperor), I., 442.
Justinian I. (Emperor), I., 341, 432, 482; II., 25.
Justinian II., Emperor, I., 535; II., 102.
Justiniani, Expounder of the Holy Scriptures, III., 481.
Justus, Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 49.
Juvavia. See *Salzburg.*
Juvenalis (Patriarch of Jerusalem), I., 428.
Juvencus (Priest), I., 487.

K.

Καθαροί. See *Cathari.*
Kahnis, IV., 362.
Kambula. See *Peking.*
Kant, IV., 347.
Karnkowsky, Archbp. of Gnesen, III., 300, 310.
Kastner, IV., 292.

Katerkamp, I., 37.
Kellner, IV., 299.
Kenrick, F. P., his works, IV., 331.
Kepler, III., 401.
Kerz, I., 37.
Kettler, Godhard von, III., 302.
Kiew (Metropolis of), II., 338; the Metropolitans in union with the Roman Church, II., 338.
Kiew (Council of), II., 338.
Kilian (St.), II., 79.
Kiss of Peace, I., 148, 499, 503.
Kistemaker, IV., 297.
Klee (Henry), IV., 294, 297.
Klein, I., 38.
Kliefoth, IV., 362.
Klopstock, IV., 93.
Klüpfel, IV., 56.
Knights (Religious Orders of), II., 503 sq.
Knights of the Sword, II., 506, 576.
Knights of St. John, II., 503.
Knights, Brethren of Prussia, II., 577.
Knights Templars, II., 504.
Knights, Teutonic, II., 505; III., 174.
Knipperdolling, III., 263.
Knox (John), III., 343 sq.
Kranach (Luke), III., 201.
Kraus (F. X.), I., 39, 92, 94; II., 5 sq.
Kurtz, I., 42; IV., 363.

L.

Labat, IV., 39.
Lacombe, IV., 29.
Lacordaire, IV., 166, 170.
Lactantius, I., 268.
Lainez, III., 375, 453.
Lamartine, IV., 162.
Lambert of Aschaffenburg (Hersfeld), I., 29.
Lambruschini, IV., 159.
Lamennais, IV., 162, 166 sq.
Lamoricière, IV., 223.
Lamps (Perpetual), I., 483.
Lamy (Bernard), IV., 75.
Landulf, II., 269.
Lanfranc, Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 240, 305, 319.
Lang (Matthew), III., 77.
Lange, I., 489.
Languages (Gift of), I., 117, 147.
Laodicea (Council of), I., 507.
Lapland, III., 175.
Lapsi, I., 189.
Lateran Synod, I., 447; II., 386, 390.
Lateran Œcumenical Council, II., 407, 418; III., 75 sq.
Latin, language and liturgy, II., 289; III., 156.
Latitudinarians, III., 415.
Latrocinium. See *Ephesus.*
Laud, Archbp. of Canterbury, III., 337.
Launoy, I., 33.
Laura, Old and New, I., 528.
Laureacum. See *Lorch.*
Laval University, IV., 335.
Lawrence (St.), Deacon and Martyr, I., 191.
Lawrence, 2nd Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 50.
Lawrence Valla, I., 30; III., 135, 143.
Lay Abbots, II., 119, 260.
Laymen (λαός), I., 138, 272; are allowed to baptize in case of necessity, I. 291.
Lazarists, III., 462.
Lazi, I., 350.
Lectors, I., 272, 456, 498.
Legacies made to the Church, I., 454, 461.
Legates of the Pope, I., 470; II., 454.
Legend (The Golden), II., 569.
Legends, I., 18.
Legio fulminatrix, I., 184.
Legio Thebaica, I., 195.
Legislation supported by religion, II., 132 sq., 478 sq.
Leibnitz, IV., 47, 85.
Leidrad, Archbp. of Lyons, II., 131.
Leipsig (Disputation of), III., 196 sq.
Leisentritt, III., 481.
Lejay (Polyglot Bible of), III., 452, 477.
Lelong (Bibliotheca sacra of), IV., 34.
Lenfant, I., 43.
Leo (St.) I., Pope, I., 424, 472; II., 24, 102.
Leo (St.) II., Pope, I., 449 sq.
Leo (St.) III., Pope, II., 101, 108, 183, 184.
Leo (St.) IV., Pope, II., 193, 298.
Leo VI., Pope, II., 214.
Leo VII., Pope, II., 214.
Leo VIII., Pope, II., 220.
Leo IX., Pope, II., 232, 236, 269, 319, 321.
Leo X., Pope, III., 76, 193, 203.
Leo XI., Pope, III., 439.
Leo XII., Pope, IV., 154.
Leo XIII., Pope, IV., 393, 398.
Leo of Achrida, II., 333.
Leo the Armenian, I., 536; II., 158.
Leo the Isaurian, I., 535; II., 102, 150, 155, 157.
Leo Judæ, III., 246, 401.
Leo the Philosopher, II., 332.
Leontius, monk, I., 434.

Leopold, Duke of Austria, II., 411.
Leopold II., Grand Duke of Tuscany, IV., 45.
Leovigild, II., 20.
Leporius, Priest of Carthage, I., 415.
Leprosoria, II., 460.
Lesley (Norman), III., 343.
Lessius, Jesuit, III., 477.
Lessing, IV., 49, 91.
Leutizes, II., 178.
Levelers, III., 339.
Levites, Deacons, I., 272.
Libanius, I., 338, 342.
Libellatici, I., 190.
Liberius, Pope, I., 376, 378 sq.
Liberties (Gallican), IV., 7, 16.
Libertines of Geneva, III., 284.
Libri Carolini, II., 160; III., 398.
Licinius, I., 326.
Liebermann, IV., 292.
Liége (School of), II., 268, 304.
Life, religious, social, and moral of the Christians, I., 145, 316, 518; II., 112, 566; III., 144.
Life, the whole of a Christian a feast. See *Feast.*
"Liga sancta," or "Holy Alliance of Nürnberg," III., 259.
Liguori (St. Alphonsus), IV., 41 sq.
Lincoln (See of), I., 174.
Lindisfarne, II., 56.
Lingard (John), II., 38; III., 315; IV., 183.
Lingerides (Claude and John de), III., 481.
Linköping (See of), II., 167.
Lissa (General Synod of the Lutherans and Calvinists), IV., 62.
Litanies, IV., 71.
Literature (the most modern Catholic) in Germany, IV., 292 sq.
Literature (Catholic) in England, IV., 183.
Litteræ formatæ et communicatoriæ, I., 271, 276, 283.
Lithuania, III., 174.
Liturgy of the apostolical constitutions, I., 305.
Liturgy of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Constantinople, &c., I., 497 sq.; the Western, Rome, Milan, I., 498; II., 289; the Gallican, II., 290; the Mozarabic, II., 290; the Slavic, II., 175, 177.
Liturgy of Cranmer, III., 324.
Liturgy of John III., King of Sweden, II., 132.
Livonia (Conversion of), II., 575.
Livonia passes over to Protestantism, III., 302.
Locherer, I., 37.
Locke (Empiricism of), IV., 36, 86.
Λόγος, I., 158, 379.
Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, I., 254; and
Λόγος προφορικός, I., 254.
Λόγος σπερματικός, I., 262.
Lollhards, II., 519.
Lombards, II., 26 sq.
Lombard (Peter), II., 529, 541.
London (See of), I., 174; II., 51.
London (Council of), II., 274.
Loos (Cornelius), III., 120, 493.
Lorch (Metrop. Church of), I., 173; II., 78, 173, 268.
Loreto, III., 155.
Lothaire I., II., 185, 199.
Lothaire II., II., 186, 388.
Louis the Bavarian, III., 12.
Louis the Child, II., 210.
Louis the German, II., 192, 206.
Louis VII., King of France, II., 390.
Louis IX. (St.), King of France, II., 430, 445.
Louis XII., King of France, III., 71.
Louis XIII., King of France, III., 380.
Louis XIV., King of France, III., 381; IV., 6, 31.
Louis XV., King of France, IV., 111.
Louis XVI., King of France, IV., 112.
Louis XVIII., King of France, IV., 160.
Louis the Mild, II., 183, 265.
Louis Philip of France, IV., 165.
Louis, King of Bavaria, IV., 202.
Louis of Granada, III., 481.
Love-feasts. See *Agapæ.*
Luca Signorelli, III., 169.
Lucian of Samosata, I., 200, 306.
Lucian, priest of Antioch, I., 363, 395.
Lucidus, a priest of Gaul, I., 412.
Lucifer of Cagliari (Calaris), I., 376, 378.
Luciferians, I., 381.
Lucilla, I., 359.
Lucius II., Pope, II., 388.
Lucius III., Pope, II., 409.
Lücke, interpreter of the Bible, IV., 355.
Ludger (St.), Bp. of Münster, II., 90.
Ludmilla, II., 176.
Lugo, S.J., Cardinal, great theologian, IV., 45.
Luitpold, Archbp. of Mentz, II., 306.
Luitprand, I., 28; II., 305.
Luke (St.), the Evangelist, I., 123.
Luke della Robbia, III., 167.
Lullus, Archbp. of Mentz, II., 86.
Lullus Raymundus, II., 561, 579.

Lumper, I., 98.
Lunéville (Peace of), IV., 128.
Lund (See of), II., 166.
Lupold of Bebenberg, III., 13.
Lupus (St.), Abbot of Ferrières, II., 308.
Lupus (St.), Bp. of Troyes, II., 24, 25.
Luther, III., 184 sq.; condemned, III., 205; his lax system, III., 199; his marriage, III., 228; his translation of the Bible, III., 246; his catechism, III., 230; his principles on matrimony, III., 229; his principles on faith, III., 234; his opinion on certain books of Holy Writ, III., 207, note; on the Fathers of the Church, III., 256, note; his fatal tendencies, III., 220, 238 sq., 272, 274; his system of exegesis, III., 272, note 2; his death, III., 271; judgment on him, III., 274.
Lutherans, III., 407.
Lutheran controversies, III., 404 sq.
Luxeuil, II., 75.
Lyons (Councils of), I., 413; II., 427, 433.

M.

Mabillon, I., 33.
Macarius, the Elder and Younger, I., 527.
Macedonians, I., 384, 419.
Macedonius, Bp. of Constantinople, I., 384.
Macchiavelli, III., 136.
MacCloskey (John), first North American Cardinal, IV., 226.
Mack (Discharge of), IV., 215.
Macon (Council of), I., 489, 491.
Macra (St.), Synod of, II., 245.
Maestricht (See of), II., 80, 266.
Magi, I., 58, 348.
Magna Charta libertatum, II., 417.
Magnentius, I., 330.
Magyars, II., 181.
Mahommed, II., 138.
Maï (Cardinal), IV., 159.
Maid of Orleans, III., 145.
Maistre (De), IV., 162.
Major (George), III., 405.
Majorinus, I., 358.
Malchion, Priest, I., 244.
Maldonatus (interpreter of the Bible), III., 476, 479.
Malebranche, IV., 32.
Mamachi, I., 35; IV., 44.
Mamertus, Archbp. of Vienne, I., 487, 490.
Mamertus, Priest. See *Claudianus.*
Manetti, III., 139.
Manharters, IV., 309.
Manichæism, I., 233, 254.
Manichæism, severe measures employed by the Emperors against it, I., 236.
Manning (H. E., Cardinal), IV., 271.
Mannon, II., 303.
Mansi, I., 35, 507, note 1; IV., 44.
Mantegna (Andrea), III., 171.
Mantua (Council of), II., 239.
Manu (laws of), I., 53.
Manual labour of Monks, I., 526.
Manumissio per testamentum, II., 461.
Manutius (Paul), III., 476.
Marat, IV., 120.
Marca (Peter de), I., 33.
Marcellus of Ancyra, I., 366, 371, 392.
Marcellus II., Pope, III., 427.
Marcia, I., 185.
Marcianus, I., 425.
Marcianus of Arles, I., 286.
Marcion, I., 228.
Marcionites, do not observe the discipline of the secret, I., 303.
Marcus Aurelius, I., 183.
Mardonius, I., 333.
Maret, IV., 251.
Marheineke, IV., 351, 383.
Mariana, III., 452, 462.
Marinus II., or "Martin III.," Pope, II., 214.
Maris the Persian, I., 423.
Marius Mercator, I., 401, note 1.
Mark (St.) the Evangelist, I., 129, 165.
Mark, John, I., 123.
Maronites, I., 450; III., 95, 517.
Marsilius Ficinus, III., 136.
Marsilius of Padua, III., 12.
Martène, I., 33.
Martin I., Pope, I., 448.
Martin IV., Pope, II., 436.
Martin V., Pope, III., 39.
Martin (St.) of Tours, I., 531; II., 32, 285.
Martin of Dunin. See *Dunin.*
Martini, Archbp. of Florence, IV., 44.
Martyrs and Martyrdom, I., 206.
Martyrs (Veneration of), I., 208, 316.
Maruthas, Bp. of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, I., 349.
Mary (the Blessed Virgin), I., 101, 129.
Mary, Immaculate Conception of, and controversy on the same, II., 561; III., 154.
Mary, feast of the Nativity of, II., 285.
Mary, cultus or veneration of, II., 286.
Mary, days dedicated to her honour, I., 491; II., 287.
Mary, Queen of England, III., 326.

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, III., 331, 345.
Mary (Brothers of), IV., 333.
Masius (Andrew), III., 478.
Mass (Sacrifice of the), I., 305, 468 · III., 220, 429.
Masses said for the souls of the faithful departed, I., 504.
Masaccio, III., 169.
Massacre of the Irish, III., 359.
Massalians, I., 532.
Massilians, I., 410.
Massillon, IV., 34.
Maternus, first bishop of Cologne, I., 173.
Maternus Firmicus, I., 346.
Mathilda (Countess), II., 354.
Mathilda, her donation, II., 369.
Mathilda, Queen of England, II., 353.
Mathurins. See *Trinitarians.*
Matrimony (Sacrament of), I., 145, 313, 516.
Matrimony, it is declared to be indissoluble, I., 145, 314, 517.
Matrimony, subject to sacerdotal blessing, I., 313, 516.
Matrimony forbidden with pagans, I., 313, 516.
Matrimony forbidden with heretics, I., 516.
Matrimony forbidden with blood relations to the seventh degree, I., 516; II., 288; this prohibition restricted to the fourth degree, II., 288.
Matteo de' Bassi, III., 454.
Matthew (St.), Apostle, I., 128.
Matther Lang, Bp. of Gurk, III., 77.
Matthew of Paris, I., 29.
Matthew (Father), IV., 187.
Matthias, Apostle, I., 117, 129.
Matthiesen, III., 263.
Maur (Congr. of St.), IV., 33.
Maurice (St.) of the Thebæan Legion, I., 195.
Maurice of Saxony, III., 275, 278.
Maurus (St.) disciple of St. Benedict, II., 35.
Maurus, Bp. of Bari, I., 166.
Maximilian I., Emperor, III., 185 sq.
Maximilian of Bavaria, III., 499.
Maximilian of Mexico, IV., 339.
Maximilla, I., 239.
Maximus the Neo-Platonist, I., 333.
Maximus the Emperor, I., 531.
Maximus the Abbot, I., 445.
Mazarin, IV., 5.
Mechitarists, III., 516.
Mecklenburg (See of), II., 178.
Medina (Bartholomew of), III., 477.
Meinwerk, II., 268.
Meinwerk, his School, II., 305.
Meissen (See of), II., 178.
Melanchthon, III., 197, 213, 217, 234 sq., 257, 407.
Melania, I., 389.
Melbourne, IV., 345.
Melchisedechians, I., 243.
Meletius of Lycopolis (Schism of), I., 301; its extinction, I., 367.
Meletian Schism at Antioch, I., 381.
Meletius of Mopsuestia, I., 421.
Meletius of Sebaste, I., 382.
Melito, Apologist, I., 203.
Mellitus, Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 49.
Memnon, Bp. of Ephesus, I., 419.
Menander, I., 154.
Mendicant Orders, II., 507 sq.
Mendicant Orders; opposition against them, II., 516.
Meng-tse, I., 51.
Mennas, Patr. of Constantinople, I., 434.
Mennonites, III., 416.
Menochius, interpreter of Holy Writ, III., 479.
Mensurius, Bp. of Carthage, I., 358.
Mentana, IV., 223.
Mentz (Metropolitan See of), II., 80.
Mentz (Councils of), II., 118, 240, 307.
Mercier, IV., 149.
Merseburg (See of), II., 178, 266.
Mersennus, III., 479.
Mesopotamia (Theol. School of), I., 457.
Metempsychosis, I., 54, 60.
Methodists, IV., 97.
Methodius, Bp. of Tyre, I., 388.
Methodius, Bp. of Pannonia and Moravia, II., 173.
Metropolitan (the three great Sees), I., 283, 464.
Metropolitan (force of the—organization), I., 282, 464; II., 101, 251.
Metropolitans, I., 283.
Metropolitans (Jurisdiction of), II., 251.
Metropolitans; oath of fidelity taken by them to the Pope, II., 454.
Metz (See of), II., 80.
Metz (Council of), II., 260.
Mexico, IV., 338.
Mezzofanti, Cardinal, IV., 159.
Michael (Feast of St.), I., 493; II., 285
Michael Cerularius, II., 333.
Michael of Cesena, III., 147.
Michael III., Emperor, II., 322.
Michael Palæologus, II., 584.
Michael the Stammerer, II., 160.
Michaelis (David), IV., 89.
Michael Angelo, III., 169.

Michelis, I., 94; IV., 298, 302.
Michl, I., 37.
Mieczyslaus, II., 179.
Middle Ages (general character of), II., 1.
Middle Ages (peculiar character of the, M. A., from a religious point of view) II., 91.
Migne, II. 298; IV., 170.
Milan; edict of toleration, granting full liberty to the Christians, promulgated there, I., 197.
Milan (Councils of), I., 376, 392.
Mileve (Council of), I., 407.
Milites Christi. See *Donatists.*
Milner, Apost. Vicar in England, IV., 183.
Milner, Church Historian, I., 44.
Miltiades, Apologist, I., 203.
Militz (Charles of), III., 194.
Minden (See of), II., 91, 266.
Minims, III., 152.
Minnesaenger, II., 563, 570.
Minorites. See *Franciscans.*
Minutius (Felix), Apologist, I., 204.
Miracles (gift of), I., 147, 177; II., 91; faith in, II., 568, note.
Missa, I., 498.
Missa Catechumenorum, I., 305, 498.
Missa Fidelium, I., 499.
Missa Marcelli, III., 490.
Missa privata, II., 289.
Missa pro defunctis, I., 504, 518.
Missa præsanctificatorum, I., 505.
Missa Votiva, I., 504.
Missal, III., 433.
Missi dominici, II., 95.
Missions, modern, III., 462, 465; IV., 42, 317.
Missions (Institutes and Congregations for), III., 462; IV., 42, 318 sq.; in America, IV., 333.
Missions, Protestant, IV., 101, 378.
Miter, I., 485.
Modestus, Apostle of the Corinthians, II., 172.
Mohammed, II., 139.
Möhler (John Adam), IV., 277, 295, 298.
Molanus (Abbot), IV., 49.
Molina (Louis), III., 483.
Molinos (Michael), IV., 26.
Monarchia ecclesiastica Siciliæ, II., 237, 373.
Monarchians, I., 242.
Monks and Monasticism, I., 315; II., 118, 488 sq.; origin, aim, and scope of monastic life, I., 522; monks originally all laymen, I., 528; congregations of monks erected in the East by Pachomius, Ammonius, and Hilarion, I., 528; in the West by Martin of Tours and Benedict of Nursia, II., 30 sq.; religious reformation by St. Benedict of Aniane, II., 259.
Monastic Congregations and Orders, II., 259 sq., 488 sq., 522 sq.; III., 148, 150.
Mongols, II., 579.
Mongus (Peter), I., 430.
Monica (St.), I., 403.
Monophysites, I., 428, 442.
Monothelites, I., 443.
Monstrance, III., 152.
Montalembert, II., 6, 564; IV., 166, 255, 263.
Montanus and Montanists, I., 237.
Monte Cassino, II., 33, 261.
Montesquieu, IV., 38.
Montfaucon, I., 33.
Montholon, III., 147, note 2.
Montpellier (Council of), II., 478.
Moore (Thomas), IV., 183.
More (Sir Thomas, Chancellor), III., 137.
Moral theology, II., 187; III., 405; IV., 32, 295.
Moravia (Conversion of), II., 173.
Moravian Brethren, III., 113, 296; IV., 94, 377.
Mörlin, III., 407.
Mormons, IV., 374.
Moses, I., 74 sq.
Moses of Chorene, I., 350.
Mosheim, I., 39.
Mozarabians, II., 83.
Mozarabic liturgy, II., 289 sq.; III., 153.
Mühlberg (battle of), III., 276.
Müller (Adam), IV., 351.
Müller (Henry), III., 402.
Müller (Julius), III., 373.
Münscher, I., 43.
Münster (See of), II., 90, 266.
Münzer (Thomas), III., 220.
Muratori, I., 35; IV., 43.
Muret, on St. Bartholomew's Day, III., 378, note 2.
Murner (Thomas, satirist), III., 302, note 1.
Music (religious), I., 486; III., 171, 470; IV., 288.
Myconius, III., 250.
Mysteries of Paganism, I., 45, 61.
Mysticism, II., 528, 535, 547; III., 128, 402; false mysticism, IV., 26.

N.

Nakatenus (Jesuit), IV., 58.
Name (Christian in), I., 348.
Names (change of names at papal elections, first instance of the kind), II., 216.
Nantes (Edict of), III., 380; its revocation, III., 381.
Naós, I., 482.

Napoleon Bonaparte, IV., 128, 142.
Napoleon III., IV., 254 sq.
Νάρθηξ, I., 482.
Nas (John), III., 474.
Natalis, Alexander, I., 33; IV., 32.
Natalis, Bp. of the Antitrinitarians, I., 243.
Natalitia Apostolorum, . 493.
Natalitia Martyrum, I., 208, 317.
National (Council of Paris), IV., 139.
Nativity (Feast of the), I., 311, 491.
Nativity, Chronological fixing of the year of the N. of Christ, I., 99 sq.
Naumburg (See of), II., 178.
Naxos, IV., 318.
Nazarenes, I., 151.
Neander, I., 40, 332, 453, note 1; II., 351, 361, 524; IV., 358.
Nectarius, Patr. of Constantinople, I., 383, 512.
Nefried of Narbonne, II., 131.
Neo-Cæsarea (Council of), I., 280.
Neo-Evangelicals, or Pietists, IV., 362.
Neo-Platonism, I., 201, 266, 331, 343.
Neo-Pythagoreans, I., 200.
Neri (St. Philip), III., 457, 491.
Nero (Emperor), I., 125.
Nerva (Emperor), I., 132.
Nestor, Historian of the Russian Church, II., 339.
Nestorius, I., 414.
Nestorians, I., 414; III., 517.
Nestorians in China, I., 351.
Netherlands (Protestantism in the), III., 382.
Netherlands (the Catholic Church in the), IV., 187, 261 sq.
Newman, IV., 265 sq.
Nice (Councils of), I., 310, 365; II., 155.
Nicephorus Callisti, I., 31.
Nicetas Choniates, II., 581.
Nicolaitanes, I., 155.
Nicolai's German Library, IV., 59.
Nicholas I., Pope, II., 199, 337.
Nicholas II., Pope, II., 235.
Nicholas III., Pope, II., 436.
Nicholas IV., Pope, II., 437, 579.
Nicholas V., Pope, III., 14, 60, 79, 113.
Nicholas de Clemangis, III., 25, 47, 127, 148.
Nicholas of Cusa, III., 46, 52, 58, 62, 78, 84, 86.
Nicholas of Flüe, III., 144.
Nicholas de Lyra, III., 139.
Nicholas of Methone, II., 581.
Nicholas of Monte Corvino, II., 579.
Nicholas of Myra, II., 339.
Nicholas of Pisa, III., 167.
Nicole, III., 476; IV., 19.
Nidaros. See *Drontheim.*
Nihus (Bartholomew), III., 410, 497.
Ninian, British Bp., II., 44.
Niobes (Stephen), I., 432.
Nisbis (Theol. School of), I., 457.
Nobles generally chosen canons, II., 462.
Noëtus, I., 245.
Nogaret (William de), II., 445, 450.
Nominal Catholics, I., 348; IV., 288.
Nominalism, II., 532; III., 126.
Nomocanon, I., 478.
Nonantula (Placidus of), II., 382.
Nonantula (Monastery of), II., 270.
Noncomformists, III., 330.
Nonnus (Monk), I., 421.
Norbert (St. Norbert, founder of the Premonstratensians), II., 496.
Norbertines. See *Premonstratensians.*
Noris (Cardinal), I., 35, 440, note 3; IV., 43.
Normans, II., 168, 232, 236 sq., 349, 364.
Northumbria (conversion of), II., 51.
Norway (conversion of), II., 167.
Norway turns Protestant, III., 315.
Notaries, I., 456.
Notker of St. Gall, II., 267, 303.
Notker Labeo, II., 303.
Notker, Bp. of Liége, II., 268.
Notker Physicus, II., 303.
Nourry (Nicholas le), I., 33.
Novatian at Rome, I., 270, 300.
Novatus at Carthage, I., 299.
Number, total, of Christians, IV., 387.
Nunciatures, I., 470; III., 442; IV., 49, 53.
Nuns, I., 529.
Nunneries, I., 529; II., 259.
Nurnberg (Assembly of Princes at), II., 413; diet of, III., 211, 215.

O.

Oberthür, IV., 54.
Oblates (Congr. of), III., 457.
Oblations or Offerings, I., 277, 500.
Obotrites, II., 178.
Obstacles opposed to the Propagation of Christianity, I., 177, 348.
Occam (William), III., 12, 17, 125, 147.
O'Connell, IV., 179.
Odensee (See of), II., 165.
Oderic Raynaldus, I., 33.
Oderic Vital, I., 29.
Odilo and Odo, Abbots of Clugny, II., 260.
Odoacer, II., 25.
Œcolampadius, III., 248 sq., 255, 401.
Œcumenius, Bp. of Tricca, II., 335.
Offertory, I., 500.

Officials (Episcopal), II., 464.
Officium, B. M. V., II., 287.
Officium, Gregorii VII., IV., 10.
Offroy de la Mettrie (Julian), IV., 39.
Olahi (Nicholas), Archbp. of Gran, III., 303.
Olaf (the Fat), II., 163.
Olaf Trygvesen, II., 167, 169.
Olaf (St.), II., 167.
Olaf, Skötkonung, II., 166.
Oldenburg (See of), II., 178.
Oleg, II., 337.
Olga, II., 337.
Olier, III., 481; IV., 331.
Oliva, II., 577.
Olivetan (Peter), III., 281.
Olivetans, III., 149.
Olmütz (See of), II., 176.
Olshausen, IV., 355.
Omer (St.), II., 81.
Ὁμιλία, I., 498.
Ommiades, II., 147.
Ὁμοιούσιος, I., 377.
Ὁμοούσιος, I., 244, 255, 367, 377.
Ophites, I., 219.
Optatus of Mileve, I., 358, 360.
Orange (Council of), I., 411.
Orarium, I., 485.
Oratorians, Italian, French, and English, III., 457; IV., 185.
Oratorio; origin of this name, III., 471.
Ordeals, II., 113.
Orders, religious. See *Monasticism.*
Orders, mendicant, II., 507; their influence, II., 516; and opposition raised against them, 516.
Orders, military and religious, II., 502; in Prussia, II., 577.
Ordination, I., 139.
Ordination of bishops, I., 275, 514.
Ordinationes absolutæ, II., 117.
Ordo de redemptione captivorum. See *Trinitarians.*
Ordo B. Mariæ de Mercede. See *Trinitarians.*
Ordo S. Brigittæ, s. Salvatoris, III., 150.
Orebites (Party of Hussites), III., 112.
Organ, I., 488; II., 290; III., 171.
Organic (articles), IV., 130.
Oriental (organization of studies), III., 139.
Origen, I., 204, 261, 264, 317.
Origenist (Controversy), I., 387, 434.
Original Sin (propagation of), I., 400.
Orlando di Lasso, III., 471.
Orleans (Councils of), I., 477, 489; II., 37.
Ornaments (church), I., 479; III., 164 sq.
Orosius (Paulus), I., 27, 340, 345, 406.
Orphan Asylums, II., 29, 459.
Orphans, Hussite sect, III., 112.
Orsi, Church Historian, I., 35.
Osbor (Synod of), II., 240.
Osiander (Luke), I., 32; III., 406.
Osiandrist (Controversy), III., 291, 406.
Osnabrück (See of), II., 90.
Ostensoria, III., 153.
Ostiarii, I., 273.
Ostrogoths, II., 17, 25.
Oswald (St.), Bp. of Worcester, II., 274.
Otfried of Weissenburg, II., 299.
Othlo, Benedictine of Ratisbon, II., 306.
Otho I. (Emperor), II., 218, 219, 220; his Diploma, II., 218.
Otho II. (Emperor), II., 222.
Otho III. (Emperor), II., 223.
Otho IV. (Emperor), II., 413.
Otho of Bamberg, II., 575.
Otho of Freisingen, I., 27.
Οὐσία, meaning and use of, I., 255.
Overberg, IV., 146, 298.
Oxford (Council of), III., 152.
Oxford (School of), IV., 185, 265.

P.

Pacca (Cardinal), IV., 53, 137, 142, 149.
Pachomius, I., 529.
Pack (Otho de), III., 231.
Pactum Calixtinum, II., 386.
Paderborn (See of), II., 90.
Paderborn (School of), II., 268, 305.
Paganism, I., 46, 338; the Gospel announced to the pagans, I., 122; obstacles put in the way of the Gospel, I., 177.
Paganism revived by Julian I., 334; reappearing in literature, III., 135.
Paganus, Paganismus, I., 338.
Pagi (Anthony), I., 33.
Pagi (Francis), II., 185, note.
Painting on glass, III., 164.
Palestine (Theological School of), I., 468.
Palestrina, III., 490.
Palladius, II., 39.
Pallavicini, I., 35; III., 204, 238, 274, 422, 429, notes 1 and 2.
Pallium of bishops, I., 485.
Pallium of catechumens, I., 292.
Pallium of metropolitans, I., 485; II., 103.
Pallium a toga ad pallium, I., 292.
Pallium (metropolitan power attached to the), II., 247, 454.
Palmieri, III., 139.
Pamphilus, priest, I., 387.
Pantaenus, I., 165, 261.

Pantheism of the pagans, I., 65; and of the heretics, II., 302, 469, 482.
Papa, peculiar title of the Bishop of Rome, I., 472.
Papal (system), III., 2, 78.
Paphnutius, I., 459.
Papers, Hist. and Polit., IV., 278, and passim.
Papias, I., 155, 157.
Parabolani, I., 456.
Parabrahma, I., 54.
Paracelsus, III., 403.
Paraguay (Jesuit mission in), III., 471.
Paris (See of), I., 167; Metropolitan See, IV., 64, note 3.
Paris (University of), II., 523.
Paris (Council of), II., 160.
Paris (Francis), IV., 23.
Parker (Matthew), III., 329.
Παροικία, 274, 464.
Parochial rights in episcopal cities, II., 255.
Πάροχος, I., 464.
Paschal, IV., 19, 32, 65.
Paschal I., Pope, II., 185.
Paschal II., Pope, II., 376.
Paschal III., Pope, II., 402.
Paschal (confession), II., 571 sq.
Paschasius Radbert, II., 298 sq., 310 sq.
Passagians, II., 471.
Passau (See of), II., 84, 115, 175, 268.
Passau (treaty of), III., 278.
Passionists, IV., 333.
Pastoral of Gregory the Great, II., 29.
Πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, I., 308.
Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, I., 308.
Patarini (association of the), II., 270.
Patarini (sect of the), II., 270.
Patriarchate (extent of its power), I., 465.
Patriarchate (Roman), I., 465 sq.
Patriarchs (Christian), I., 464; determination of their rights, I., 468.
Patriarchs (Œcumenical), I., 468; II., 333.
Patrician dignity of the Frankish kings, II., 109.
Patrick (St.), Apostle of Ireland, II., 39 sq.
Patrimony of Peter, II., 104; importance and necessity of it, III., 5, note.
Patripassionists, I., 244.
Patronage (right of), I., 464; II., 251.
Paul (St.), Apostle, I., 120 sq.; his ideas on the Church, I., 143; his journeys, I., 122 sq.
Paul of Alexandria, I., 442.
Paul of Constantinople, I., 449.
Paul Cortesius, III., 135.
Paul the Deacon, II., 117, 125.
Paul of Emesa, I., 421.
Paul of Samosata, I., 243.
Paul of Thebes, I., 315, 525.
Paul Warnefried, II., 125, 270.
Paul II., Pope, III., 63.
Paul III., Pope, III., 422.
Paul IV., Pope, III., 427.
Paul V., Pope, III., 439.
Paulianists, I., 244; the baptism of the Paulianists declared invalid, I., 295.
Paulicians, I., 534; II., 339, 478.
Paulinus (St.) of Nola, I., 487.
Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileïa, I., 441; II., 125.
Paulists, IV., 333.
Paulus, Professor of Heidelberg, IV., 320.
Pavia (Council of), II., 227, 270, 288.
Peace (kiss of,) I., 146, 499, 503.
Pearson, I., 42.
Peasants (war of the), III., 221.
Pedobaptism, I., 495.
Peking, II., 579.
Pelagianism, I., 401 sq.; is suppressed in the East, I., 407.
Pelagius, British Monk, I., 400.
Pelagius I., Pope, I., 441.
Pelagius II., Pope, I., 476.
Pelagius, Roman Apocrisiarius, I., 435.
Pelagius Alvarus. See *Alvarus*.
Pelbart, III., 159.
Pelican (Conrad), III., 401.
Pella, I., 135.
Pelliccia, I., 35; IV., 44.
Pellisson, IV., 47.
Penance (Sacrament of), I., 146, 296, 509.
Penance books, I., 513.
Penance (public), I., 511; II., 121, 294.
Penitential Discipline, I., 296, 509 sq.; II., 119, 294, 573; III., 173.
Penitential Discipline at first directed by the bishops, I., 299.
Penitentiary (Priests), I., 299, 512; he is the bishop's representative *in foro interno*, II., 465.
Penitents divided into four classes, I., 298, 511; II., 118, 294, 570; III., 179.
Pentecost, I., 117, 310.
Pepin of Heristal, II., 38.
Pepin, II., 38, 105, 106; his donation, II., 105; augmented by Charlemagne, II., 106.
Pepuzians, I., 240.
Peregrinus Proteus, I., 184.
Περιοδευτής, I., 464.
Perpetua and Felicitas (SS.), I., 185.

Perpinian, III., 452.
Perrone, IV., 158.
Persecutions of the Christians, I., 118, 180, 197, 348; II., 21.
Persia (Propagation of Christianity in), I., 165, 348; persecutions of the Christians in, I., 351.
Perugino, III., 169.
Pest-houses for lepers, II., 460.
Petavius, I., 33; III., 473; IV., 32.
Peter (St.), Apostle, I., 109, 122; head of the Church, I., 126, 137; his apostolic labours, I., 126; established himself at Rome, I., 125; where he is crucified, I., 126; his twenty-five years' Roman pontificate, I., 127, note 2.
Peter d'Ailly, III., 27, 35.
Peter of Alexandria, I., 301.
Peter Amandus, III., 291.
Peter of Andlo, III., 14.
Peter, Patr. of Antioch, II., 334.
Peter of Bruis, II., 469.
Peter of Castelnau, II., 469.
Peter Chrysologus, I., 424.
Peter Comestor, II., 523.
Peter Flotte, II., 445.
Peter the Fuller, I., 429.
Peter Galle, II., 3; III., 305.
Peter the Hermit, II., 373.
Peter Jacobson, Bp. of Westerås, III., 305.
Peter, Patr. of Jerusalem, I., 436.
Peter Lombard. See *Lombard.*
Peter Mongus, I., 430.
Peter Nolasco, II., 501.
Peter of Pisa, II., 129.
Peter of Poitiers, II., 543.
Peter the Venerable, II., 490.
Peter *de Vineis*, II., 423, 428.
Peter Waldus, II., 472.
Peter's pence, II., 273; IV., 223.
Peterson (Olaf and Lawrence), III., 305.
Petrarca, III., 20, 134.
Petrikau (Council of), III., 297.
Petrobrusiani, II., 470.
Pflug (Julius), III., 260, 266, 276.
Phantasiastæ, I., 432.
Pharisees, I., 86.
Philip (St.), Apostle, I., 129.
Philip the Arabian, I., 187 sq.
Philip Augustus, King of France, II., 411, 414.
Philip IV., the Fair, II., 443.
Philip of Hessia, III., 229, 262, 275; his bigamy, III., 264.
Philip II., of Spain, III., 383.
Philippine Islands, IV., 345.
Philippists, III., 407.
Phillips, I., 16; II., 10; IV., 298.
Philo, I., 84.
Philology (Ecclesiastical), I., 19, note 1.
"Philopatris" (Dialogue), I., 342.
Philoponus John), I., 432.
Philosophy and theology, I., 262, 269.
Philosophy (Modern), IV., 85, 350 sq.
Philostorgius, I., 26.
Philostratus, I., 200.
Photinus, I., 392.
Photius, II., 323, 335; his followers condemned, II., 331.
Physiocrats, IV., 39.
Piacenza (Synod of), II., 370.
Piarists, III., 462.
Pico della Mirandola, III., 136.
Picts, II., 44.
Pietism, IV., 83, 362, 374.
Pilate, I., 103.
Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, I., 520; II., 373; IV., 319.
Pilgrimages to the shrines of saints, II., 180.
Pilgrimage to Rome, II., 282, 295.
Pilgrimage to Compostella, I., 166; II., 291.
Pilgrim, Bp. of Passau, II., 182, 267.
Pirhing, IV., 58.
Pirkheimer (Willibald), III., 202, 204, 225, 252.
Pisa (Council of), III., 28 sq.
Pistorius, III., 261.
Pitra (O. S. B., Cardinal), IV., 170.
Pitroff, IV., 57.
Pius II., Pope, III., 62.
Pius III., Pope, III., 72.
Pius IV., Pope, III., 435.
Pius V., Pope, III., 436.
Pius VI., Pope, IV., 14, 126.
Pius VII., Pope, IV., 127, 149.
Pius VIII., Pope, IV., 155.
Pius IX., Pope, IV., 218, 225.
Placidus, disciple of St. Benedict, II., 35.
Placidus, Prior of Nonantula, II., 382.
Planck, I., 40; III., 225; IV., 385.
Platina, III., 64.
Plato, I., 63; II., 533.
Platonism of the Fathers, I., 94 sq., 266.
Platonists, I., 63; III., 135.
Plebeians to be likewise admitted into Cathedral Chapters, II., 461, note 2.
Plenary Councils of Baltimore, IV., 330.
Plenaries, IV., 399.
Plotho (Themistius), III., 136.
Plettenburg (Walter of), III., 301.
Pliny the Younger, I., 146 (note 7), 319.

Plock (See of), II., 180; IV., 218.
Plotinus, I., 201.
Plutarch, I., 200.
Pneumatomachoi, I., 384.
Poeschl, IV., 309.
Poetry (Christian), I., 486.
Poetry, popular in the M. A., II., 564.
Poland (Conversion of), II., 178, 574; synods and synodal statutes in Poland, II., 415 (note 1); III., 298; attempts of the Protestants to drag her into their sect, III., 296 sq.; partition of Poland, IV., 62, 63.
Pole (Cardinal), III., 322, 327.
Polemics of the Pagans, I., 198, 341.
Polenz (John of), Bp. of Samland, III., 290.
Polycarp (St.), Bp. of Smyrna, I., 157, 184, 281, 310.
Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, I., 171, 310.
Polyglot (Bibles), the Complutensian, III., 139; the Antwerp and Paris, III., 477.
Polynesia, III., 107.
Polytheism, I., 48.
Pombal, IV., 63.
Pomerania, II., 180, 574.
Pomponazzo (Peter), III., 136.
Pontanus, III., 452.
Ponticus, I., 184.
"Pontifex Maximus," a title still retained by Christian emperors, I., 327; but is put aside by Gratian, I., 338.
Poor-houses, II., 460.
Pope, title reserved for the Bishop of Rome, I., 472.
Pope; election of Popes; regulations of Nicholas II. on this head, II., 236; of Alexander III., II., 407; of Gregory X., IV., 94; of Gregory XV., III., 440; last instance of a papal election being ratified by the secular power, II., 349.
Popes; they always persevere in the true faith, I., 469, note 1; the coronation of the Popes, II., 248; first instance of this ceremony, II., 199; the Popes fall into a disgraceful dependence upon the Marquis of Tuscany, II., 211; they convoke councils and confirm their acts, II., 454; they give absolution from certain grievous crimes, II., 454; and grant all manner of dispensations, II., 454; the Pope is the centre of Catholic unity, I., 142; and has the primacy of honour and jurisdiction, I., 143, 246, 284, 294, 407, 411, 467 sq.; II., 101 sq., 247, 292, 324, 333, 419, 452; is the Pope superior or inferior to the council, III., 35 sq.; his relation to the German Christian Emperor, II., 109, 134, 207, 220 sq., 245; Gemini principes, duo luminaria, et duo gladii, I., 454; II., 343, 352, 424; the Pope's position after the Reformation, III., 442, 515 sq.; chronological table of the Popes, I., 539; II., 585; III., 519; IV., 393; the Popes preside over councils, I., 366 (note), 417, 426, 468, 476; the Pope alone can depose a bishop, I., 469.
Popular religious chants, I., 145, 305, 487; III., 156.
Popular traditions, I., 18.
Popular philosophy, IV., 86, 91.
Porch or vestibule of a church, I., 482.
Porphyrius, pupil of Plotinus, I., 192, 201; II., 533.
Portiuncula, II., 514.
Port-Royal (Abbey of), IV., 20 sq.
Portugal (recent religious events of), IV., 176 sq., 252.
Posen, the most ancient see of Poland, II., 179; Jordan, first bishop, II., 179.
Possevin, Jesuit, III., 310, 459, 476.
Postulant, II., 34.
Pothinus (St.), Bp. of Lyons, I., 167, 184.
Potken (John), III., 140.
Pott (John Henry), IV., 81.
Powder-conspiracy, III., 333.
Powondra, IV., 298.
Pradt (Abbé de), IV., 141.
Prædicatores, II., 509.
Præfatio, I., 501.
Pragmatic sanction, II., 431.
Pragmatic sanction of Bourges, III., 59, 77, 80, 372.
Prague (See of), II., 178.
Praxeas, I., 244.
Prayer, seven times a day, I., 491; II., 34.
Praylus, Bp. of Jerusalem, I., 407.
Preaching, I., 499; III., 156; by the bishop, I., 463.
Prechtl (Abbot), III., 269 (note 1); IV., 47 (note 2).
Precistæ, II., 454.
Precious Blood (Congr. of the), IV., 333.
Predestination, I., 412; II., 306; III., 214, 250, 287.
Premices. See *First Fruits*.
Premonstratensians (Order of), II., 297.
Presbyter (John), IV., 235.
Presbyter pœnitentiarius, I., 299, 512.

Presbyters, I., 139.
Presbyters subordinate to bishops, I., 139; they begin to preach before the bishop, first instance of the kind in the West, I., 463; writings on the dignity of the priesthood, I., 458.
Presbyteræ, I., 142, note 3.
Prierias, III., 191.
Priesthood (universal), I., 139.
Priesthood (special), I., 138.
Priesthood and Royalty, I., 454; II., 246.
Priests (Ordination of), I., 137, 514.
Priestly, I., 44.
Primacy of the Bp. of Rome. See *Popes.*
Primasius of Adrumentum, II., 122.
Primitive revelations, I., 45, 72.
Princes (Concordat of), III., 56.
Prior, II., 34, 515.
Prisca translatio, I., 478.
Priscilla, I., 239.
Priscillian, I., 529.
Priscillianists, I., 530.
Private chapels of the nobles, II., 251.
Privileges granted by the Popes to churches and monasteries, II., 247.
Privilegium Fori, II., 460.
Probabilism, III., 477.
Proclus, Patr. of Constantinople, I., 344, 422.
Proclus, Neo-Platonist, I., 344.
Procopius, the Elder and the Younger, III., 112.
Procuratores. See *Administrators.*
Professio fidei Tridentina, III., 433.
Propaganda, III., 465 sq.; IV., 150.
Propagation of Christianity in Asia, I., 122, 129, 163, 348; II., 578; III., 466; IV., 73, 318 sq.; in Africa, I., 165, 352; II., 579; III., 472; IV., 79, 325 sq.; in America, III., 177, 471; IV., 75 sq., 327 sq.; in Australia, IV., 345; in Europe, I., 131, 166; II., 17, 162; III., 173 sq.; obstacles opposed to the propagation of Christianity, I., 348; II., 91.
Proselytes of the Gate and of Justice, I., 86.
Prosper (St.), I., 410.
Proterius, Patr. of Alexandria, I., 429.
Protestantism, origin of the name, III., 232; spread of Protestantism outside of Germany and Switzerland, III., 390 sq.; character of Protestantism, III., 392; causes of its rapid spread, III., 387.
Protoctistoi, I., 436.
Protogenes, Bp. of Sardica, I., 365
Provincial Councils, I., 283; II., 251; provisions for their regular holding, I., 477; III., 52, 432, 444.
Provincial of the Dominicans, II., 516.
Prudentius (hymns of), I., 487.
Prudentius, Bp. of Troyes, II., 308.
Prussia (Conversion of), II., 576, turns Protestant, III., 290; establishment of the Kingdom of Prussia, and the Pope's protestation against it, IV., 8; recent conflict of Prussia with the Holy See, IV., 206; evangelical union, IV., 361.
Pseudo-Synod of the Oak, I., 390.
Psyche (myth of), I., 70.
Ptolemais, II., 437.
Ptolemy de Fiadonibus, I., 30.
Public confession, I., 297, 511.
Public schools, II., 29, 125 sq.
Pulcheria, I., 425.
Purcell (Archbp.), IV., 329, 332, 334; Very Rev. Edward, IV., 334.
Puritans, III., 330.
Pusey, IV., 185, 265.
Pyrrhus of Constantinople, I., 447 sq.
Pythagoreans, I., 63.

Q.

Quadragesimal Fast, I., 308.
Quadratus, Bp. of Athens, and Apologist, I., 203.
Quadrivium, II., 125; III., 133.
Quakers, IV., 95.
Quarterly Amer. Cath. Rev., IV., 334.
Quartodecimans, I., 310.
Quelen, Archbp. of Paris, IV., 165.
Quensted, IV., 81.
Quesnel, IV., 45.
Quietism, IV., 26 sq.
Quinisextum (Council), I., 451.

R.

Raab (See of), II., 182.
Rabanus Maurus, II., 299, 308, 312.
Rabulas, Bp. of Edessa, I., 422.
Racine (Bonaventure), I., 35.
Rainald of Dassel, II., 397.
Rakow (Catechism of), III., 418.
Rancé (Bouthillier de), IV., 40.
Raphael of Urbino, III., 134.
Raskolniks, IV., 107.
Ratherius, Bp. of Verona, II., 270, note 1, 293.
Ratisbon (See of), II., 77, 85; Council of Ratisbon, II., 131; league of the Catholic princes, III., 217; diet of, III., 260.

Ratramnus, Monk of Corvey, II., 307, 312.
Ratzeburg (See of), II., 178.
Rauscher (Cardinal), I., 37.
Rautenstrauck, IV., 50.
Ravaillac (Francis), III., 381.
Ravenna, I., 166.
Ravignan (Jesuit), IV., 170.
Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, II., 478.
Raymond VII., Count of T., III., 121.
Raymond Lullus, II., 562, 579.
Raymond Martini, III., 176.
Raymond of Pennaforte, II., 501, 563.
Raymond du Puy, II., 503.
Raymond of Sabunde, III., 126.
Raynaldus (Oderic), I., 33.
Reaction of the Protestants against the Rationalism of Bruno Baur, IV., 353.
Readoption of fallen Christians, I., 296 sq.
Realism, Nominalism, and Conceptualism, II., 532 sq.; III., 125.
Reccared, II., 19.
Recess, III., 240, 261.
Receveur, I., 35.
Recollects, IV., 332.
Recommendation (Letters of) of the Martyrs, I., 299.
Reconciliation of Sinners, I., 297, 511.
Redemptorists, IV., 41, 332.
Reformed Church, III., 412; divisions breaking out in its bosom, III., 412 sq.
Regale (controversy on the), IV., 6.
Reginald, Bp. of Spire, II., 268.
Regino of Prüm, I., 30; II., 247, 303.
Reginum. See *Ratisbon.*
Regula fidei, I., 263.
Reichenau, II., 77.
Reiffenstuel, IV., 59.
Relations between Church and State in Germany, II., 91 sq.
Religio licita, I., 191.
Religion (idea of), I., 1.
Religion of the pagan nations, I., 46 sq.; II., 11, 171.
Religion (edict concerning religion in Prussia), IV., 347.
Religion of force, II., 292.
Religious Conference of Marburg, III., 233.
Religious Conference of Ratisbon, III., 260, 270.
Religious Conference of Thorn, III., 497.
Religious Conference of Worms, III., 495.
Religious Conferences of Baden and Emmendingen, III., 49 .
Religious differences settled by the peace of Augsburg, III., 277; and Nürnberg, III., 241.
Relics (veneration of), among Catholics, I., 208, 492, 533; II., 291; III., 432; among Protestants, III., 274.
Rembert, II., 165.
Remigius (St.), Archbp. of Rheims, II., 36, 285.
Remigius of Lyons, II., 307.
Remismond, II., 18.
Remonstrants, III., 412.
Reparatus, Bp. of Carthage, I., 508.
Reservatum ecclesiasticum, III., 278.
Residence (duty of), in monks, II., 34.
Responsories, I., 487.
Restitution (Edict of), III., 501.
Resurrection of Christ, I., 114.
Reuchlin, III., 139.
Reval (See of), II., 576.
Revelation (primitive), I., 46 sq., 72.
Revolution (French), IV., 110 sq.
Rheims (School of), II., 266, 305.
Rheims Seminary for Catholic Englishmen, III., 332.
Rheims (Councils of), II., 122, 245, 471, 497, 540.
Rhense (Electoral Assembly of), III., 16.
Rhinocorura (Theological School of), I., 457.
Ribera (de), IV., 45.
Ricci (Lawrence), IV., 70.
Ricci (Matthew), III., 468.
Ricci (Scipio), Bp. of Pistoja, IV., 45 sq.
Richard of Cornwallis, II., 429.
Richard Cœur de Lion, II., 411.
Richard Simon, IV., 34.
Richard of St. Victor, II., 546, 548.
Richelieu, III., 381, 503.
Richer, III., 442.
Riculph, Archbp. of Mentz, II., 197.
Rienzi (Cola de), III., 19.
Riffel (works of), I., 323; III., 182, 252; he is deposed, IV., 215.
Riga, II., 576.
Right of the Stronger, II., 292.
Rigorism of some Christians, I., 299; II., 295; III., 173.
Rimini (Council of), I., 379.
Ring and Crosier, I., 486; II., 245.
Ritter (J. J.), I., 38.
Robber-Synod. See *Ephesus.*
Robbia (Luke della). See *Luke.*
Robert of Arbrissel, II., 499.
Robert Molesme, Abbot of Cîteaux, II., 490.
Robert Fludd, III., 404.
Robert Guiscard, II., 234, 236.

Robert, Bp. of Liége, III., 153.
Robert Pulleyne, II., 541, 550.
Robespierre, IV., 120.
Roderic, II., 82.
Rodriguez, III., 447, 481.
Rogationum dies, I., 490.
Roger Bacon, II., 561, 563.
Roger of Béziers, II., 478.
Rohrbacher, I., 35; IV., 170.
Röhr, IV., 349.
Rolfus, IV., 299.
Romans (Religion and morals of the), I., 66.
Romanus (Monk), II., 31.
Rome; her importance as the See of the Head of the Church, I., 285 sq.; Councils of Rome, I., 373, 394, 417; II., 150, 219, 231, 232, 234, 319 sq., 349, 350.
Rome-Scot, II., 273.
Romuald (Congr. of St.), II., 261.
Rongé IV., 311.
Rosary (Confraternity of the), III., 156.
Rosary (Feast of the), III., 156.
Rosary mode of prayer, II., 287; III., 156.
Roscelin, II., 535.
Roscruciani, III., 403.
Röskild (See of), II., 165.
Rosmini-Serbati, IV., 158, note.
Rossi (Minister), IV., 221.
Rossi (Bernard), IV., 52.
Rossi (Cavaliere de'), I., 305, note 1; IV., 232.
Rottmann (Bernard), III., 262.
Rousseau (J. B.), IV., 300.
Rousseau (J. J.), IV., 39.
Royko, I., 37.
Rudolph (Agricola), III., 137.
Rudolph of Hapsburg, II., 435.
Rudolph of Suabia, II., 362, 364.
Rue (De la), I., 33; IV., 33.
Rufinus, Priest of Aquileja, I., 26, 387.
Rufinus, Priest of Syria, I., 401.
Rügen (Conversion of the island of), II., 575.
Rule of Faith. See *Regula Fidei.*
Rule of St. Benedict, II., 33.
Rupert of Deutz, II., 548.
Rupert, Bp. of Worms, II., 78.
Rupp, IV., 353.
Rural Bishops. See *Chorepiscopi.*
Rural Chapters, II., 253.
Russia (Conversion of), II., 337.
Russia; the Catholic Church in Russia, IV., 216, 314.
Russian; Græco-Russian Church, III., 508 sq.; IV., 105 sq., 316.
Rusticus, Roman Deacon, I., 441.
Ruttenstock, I., 38.
Ruysbroch (John), III., 130.

S.

Sabas (St.), Abbot, I., 527.
Sabbath, I., 147.
Sabeans or Homerites. See that name.
Sabellius, I., 245 sq.
Saccarelli, I., 35.
Sacramentarians (Discussion of the), III., 252 sq.
Sacred Heart (Ladies of the), IV., 256.
Sacrament (Feast of the Blessed), III., 153.
Sacrifices (Private, forbidden), I., 328; bloody, interdicted, I., 328; pagan officials instructed not to participate in public, I., 328.
Sacrifices all forbidden, I., 328.
Sacrilege (Law against), IV., 163.
Sacy (Le maistre de), IV., 34.
Sadduceans, I., 86.
Sadolet, III., 478.
Sagittarius, I., 39.
Sahag, Patr. of the Armenians, I., 350.
Sailer, IV., 292, 295.
Sainte-Foi, IV., 170.
Saint Martin, IV., 13 .
Saints; All Saints' Day, I., 493; II., 286.
Saints (ἅγιοι), name of the Christians, I., 145.
Saints; earliest objects of the *true* veneration of the, I., 208; II., 156.
Saisette (Bernard), Bp. of Pamiers, II., 445.
Salary of the Clergy by the State, II., 466.
Salmeron (Alphonse), III., 479.
Salpetrians, IV., 309.
Salvianus, I., 340, 348; II., 22.
Salzburg, II., 77, 86; Protestant emigration from Salzburg, IV., 103.
Samaritans, I., 86.
Sambuga, IV., 292.
Samland (See of), II., 577.
Samosatenians, I., 243.
Samson (Bernard), III., 245,
Samuel of Worms, II., 126.
Santarel, III., 442.
Sarabaites, I., 528.
Saragossa (Council of), I., 530.
Sardica (Council of), I., 375.
Sarpi (Paolo), I., 35; III., 422, 439, 442.
Sartorius, IV., 361.
Saturday (Fast of), I., 307.
Saturday consecrated to the B. V., II., 287.

Saturninus the Gnostic, I., 225.
Saul, persecutor of the Christians, I., 120.
Saul (Monastery of), II., 41.
Savonarola, III., 71, 158.
Saxons (Conversion of the), II., 88.
Scandinavia, II., 15.
Scapular (Confraternities of the), II., 499.
Schaff (Dr.), I., 41; IV., 373.
Schaffner (M.), III., 171.
Schall (Adam), III., 469.
Scheibel, IV., 361.
Schelling, IV., 350.
Schenkel, IV., 358, 360.
Schiller, IV., 93.
Schism (Definition of), I., 3.
Schism (Greek), II., 333.
Schism (Western), I., 441; III., 23.
Schlegel (Frederic von), IV., 199.
Schleiermacher, I., 43; IV., 350, 360.
Schmalfuss, I., 37.
Schmalkalden (Articles of), III., 259.
Schmalkalden (League of), III., 240, 259.
Schmalkalden (War of), III., 275 sq.
Schmalzgrueber, IV., 59.
Schmid (Christian), I., 40 or 42.
Schmid (J. A.), I., 39.
Schmitt (H. J.), III., 508.
Schnepf, III., 242.
Schoen (Martin), III., 171.
Schola Palatina, II., 125.
Scholastica (St.), II., 35.
Scholasticism, II., 526, 535, 549; III., 125, 178.
Scholz, IV., 296.
Schools, divergent theological, I., 260, 394.
Schools established by bishops, II., 126, 297.
School of Classics, interdicted to the Christians by Julian, I., 334.
Schools (Brothers and Sisters of the Christian), III., 462; IV., 133, 333.
Schoolmen, III., 115.
Schröckh, I., 39.
Schwabach or Torgau (Articles of), III., 232.
Schwarz (Ildephonse), IV., 292.
Schwarzel, IV., 57, 298.
Schwarzhuber, IV., 292.
Schwegler, IV., 358.
Schwenkfeld, III., 416.
Sciarra Colonna, II., 450.
Science (Principles of theological), I., 258.
Science, divergent forms of it, I., 260; II., 525 sq.
Scillitan (Martyrs), I., 185.
Scotists, II., 560.
Scotland (Conversion of), II., 44; she passes over to Protestantism, III., 342; Catholic elements in Scotland, IV., 185; restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in Scotland, IV., 276.
Seasons (Holy), I., 146, 307.
Seclucianus, III., 292, 297.
Sects (Idea of), I., 3.
Sects, fanatical and refractory, II., 468.
Secularization, first practised in the peace of Westphalia, III., 504.
Secularization of the States of the Church, IV., 137, 223.
Secularization of the ecclesiastical principalities in Germany, IV., 143.
Secundus of Tigisis, I., 358.
Sedulius, author of hymns, I., 487; II., 278.
Segarelli (Gerard), II., 484.
Segneri, III., 481.
Seguier, IV., 39.
Self-flagellation, II., 295; III., 173.
Seleucia-Ctestiphon, Metropolis, I., 423.
Seleucia (Council of), I., 378.
Seleucia (See of), I., 348.
Seleucia, the residence of a Nestorian bishop, I., 423.
Seelburg (See of), II., 576.
Sees of Bishops, I., 268.
Seligenstadt (See of), II., vide *Halberstadt.*
Selon (See of), II., 576.
Selvaggio, I., 35; IV., 44.
Semgallen, II., 576.
Semi-Arians, I., 377.
Seminaries (Clerical), I., 457; III., 431, 445; IV., 147, 334.
Seminary (Mt. St. Mary's of the West), IV., 334.
Semi-Pelagians, I., 406.
Semler, I., 39; IV., 89.
Seneca, I., 70.
Separation of the Church from the Synagogue, I., 133.
Separation of Church and State, IV., 3.
Septuagint (Version), I., 84; III., 479.
Sepulture (Christian), I., 315, 518.
Serapeion (Destruction of the), I., 339.
Sergius I., Pope, I., 442.
Sergius II., Pope, II., 191.
Sergius III., Pope, II., 212.
Sergius, Patr. of Constantinople, I., 443.
Sergius (Paul), I., 122.
Sermon, I., 499.
Servatus Lupus, II., 313.
Servede (Michael), III., 284.

Servians, II., 172.
Servites, II., 518.
Servus Servorum Dei, I., 472.
Sethites, I., 221.
Severians (Monophysites), I., 431.
Severians, partisans of Tatian, I., 227.
Severin (St.), II., 77.
Severus of Antioch, I., 431.
Severus (Monk), I., 430.
Shaftesbury, IV., 36.
Shapur, II., 359.
Sibylline (oracles), I., 175.
Sicilian (Vespers), II., 436.
Sicily conquered by the Normans, and received as a fief from the Holy See, II., 232, 372.
Sickingen (Francis of), III., 202.
Sidney, IV., 345.
Sidonius Apollinaris (St.), Bp. of Clermont, II., 19.
Sieciechow (Abbey of), II., 180.
Siena (Council of), III., 43.
Sieyes, IV., 113.
Sigismund (St.), King of the Burgundians, II., 23.
Sigismund (Emperor), III., 33.
Sigismund I., King of Poland, III., 296. 296.
Sigismund, Augustus II., III., 297.
Sigismund III., King of Poland and Sweden, III., 299.
Signaculum sinus, manuum et oris, I., 236.
Sigonius (Aurelius), I., 35.
Siguier, IV., 170.
Silesia (Conversion of), II., 181.
Silesia passes over to Protestantism, III., 293.
Simeon (St.), Bp. of Jerusalem, I., 182.
Simeon Metaphrastes, II., 335.
Simeon, Bp. of Seleucia, I., 348.
Simeon (St.), the Stylite, I., 421, 514, 529.
Simon the Magician, I., 120, 152.
Simon of Montfort, II., 478.
Simon Stock, II., 499.
Simony, I., 152; II., 116, 350.
Simony, laws passed against, II., 236, 265, 368.
Simplicius, Neo-Platonist, I., 344.
Sin, original. See *Original sin.* Sins, absolution from which was denied even to the dying, I., 298 sq.; detailed confession of sins, I., 146, 296, 509; II., 571.
Singing-schools, I., 487; II., 290.
Siricius, I., 470, 531.
Sirmium (Councils of), I., 377, 392.
Sirmian formularies of faith, I., 378.
Sirmond, I., 33.
Sisters of the Free Spirit, II., 484.
Sixtus IV., Pope, III., 64.
Sixtus V., Pope, III., 437.
Skalholt (See of), II., 169.
Skara (See of), II., 166.
Skarga (Peter), III., 301, 481.
Scepticism, I., 69, 198; II., 439.
Scepticism (Historical), IV., 35.
Scepticism of the Neo-Peripatetics, III., 136.
Slavery, I., 49; greatly mitigated, and finally abolished, by Christianity, I., 318, 325, 492; II., 461.
Slaves, II., 170 sq.
Sleepers (the Seven), I., 190.
Societies for the propagation of good books, IV., 161, 202, 299.
Socinians, III., 418.
Socinus (Faustus), III., 418; (Lelius), III., 418.
Socrates (Church Historian), I., 25.
Soissons (Council of), II., 86, 203, 535, 537.
Somascs, III., 456, 461.
Sommier (French theologian), IV., 32.
Son of God (Doctrine of the Church on Christ as the), I., 254, 663 sq.
Sophronius, Monk and Patriarch of Jerusalem, I., 444.
Sorbonne, III., 25, 485.
Sorcery, III., 144, 393.
Sorores de Militia Christi, II., 511.
Souls, All Souls-day, II., 286.
South America, IV., 341.
Sozomenus, Hermias, I., 27.
Spain (Propagation of Christianity in), I., 166; II., 19; latest events there, IV., 171, 250.
Spalding (M. J.), his works, IV., 331.
Spee (Frederic von der), III., 122, 489, 496; IV., 81.
Spener, IV., 82.
Spire (See of), II., 80.
Spire (Diet of), III., 232.
Spinola (Christian Rojas), IV., 47.
Spinoza, IV., 85.
Spirituales, II., 518; III., 148.
Spittler, I., 40.
Spondanus of Pamiers, I., 33.
Sponsores (fideijussores), I., 291.
Sprenger, III., 144.
Squarcione Giacomo, III., 171.
Stanislaus (St.), Bp. of Cracow, II., 181.
Stäudlin, I., 40.
Stattler (Benedict), IV., 56.
Staudenmaier, IV., 294.
Staupitz, III., 187.
Stavanger (See of), II., 168.
Stephen I., Pope, I., 294, 295.

Stephen (II.), III., Pope, II., 105.
Stephen (III.), IV., Pope, II., 107, note.
Stephen (IV.), V., Pope, II., 184.
Stephen (V.), VI., Pope, II., 209.
Stephen (VI.), VII., Pope, II., 211.
Stephen (VII.), VIII., Pope, II., 214.
Stephen (VIII.), IX., Pope, II., 214.
Stephen (IX.), X., Pope, II., 234.
Stephen (St.), Protomartyr, I., 119, 492.
Stephen (St.), King of Hungary, II., 182.
Stephen, Bp. of Dora, I., 446.
Stephen (St.), Harding, II., 490, note 1.
Stephen of Lisiac, II., 494.
Stephen Niobes, I., 427.
Stephen of Tigerno, II., 493.
Stercoranism, II., 311.
Stewards. See *Administrators.*
Stigmatum, festum, II., 515.
Stoics, I., 65, 198.
Stole, I., 485.
Stolberg (Frederic Leopold), I., 37; IV., 146, 276.
Stolz (Alban), IV., 299.
Storch (Nicholas), III., 217.
Strasburg (See of), II., 80.
Strauss, IV., 352, 359, 360.
Strengnäs (See of), II., 167.
Strigel (Victorin), III., 405.
Sturleson (Snorre), II., 169; III., 183.
Sturm (Abbot), II., 86.
Stylites, I., 529.
Suabia (Mirror of), II., 394.
Suarez (Jesuit), III., 476.
Subiaco, II., 32.
Substance, I., 255.
Suevi, II., 17.
Suidas, II., 335.
Suidbert, II., 81.
Sulpicians, IV., 331, 335.
Sulpitius Severus, I., 27.
Sunday, I., 307; the Manichæeans fast on Sundays, I., 236; the Catholics do not, I., 307.
Sunnia, II., 18.
Superattendents or Superintendents, III., 230, 395.
Superpositio jejunii, I., 308.
Superstition, III., 143; among Protestants, III., 395; IV., 81.
Support of the clergy. See *Tithes.*
Supralapsarians, III., 412.
Supremacy (Oath of), III., 318, 328.
Surius, III., 481.
Suso (Henry), III., 130.
Sutri (Council of), II., 230.
Sweden; her conversion to Christianity, II., 166; she turns Protestant, III., 305; intolerant down to the present day, IV., 368.
Swedenborg (Emmanuel), IV., 100.
Swerker, King of Sweden, II., 166.
Switzerland (Conversion of), II., 73.
Switzerland; her religious situation at the present day, IV., 192, 289.
Sylvester I., Pope, I., 365, 472.
Sylvester II., Pope, II., 182, 228, 374.
Symbol of the Apostles, I., 159 (note *), 253; is enlarged in proportion to the new heresies arising, I., 353 sq.
Symbol of Nice, I., 366, note.
Symbol of St. Athanasius, I., 385.
Symbol (the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan), I., 385, note 1.
Symbol of Ephesus, I., 421, note *.
Symbol of Chalcedon, I., 426, note 3.
Symbol of the 3rd Council of Constantinople, I., 449, note 2.
Symbolic books, III., 392.
Symbolism considered as a science, IV., 385 sq.
Symeon. See *Simeon.*
Symmachus, consular dignitarian, II., 26.
Symmachus, Pope, I., 430.
Symmachus (Prefect), I., 343.
Syncellus, I., 456.
Syncretism (signification of the word), III., 410 note.
Syncretic Controversy, III., 410.
Synergistic Controversy, III., 405.
Synesius, I., 458, 523.
Synnada (Council of), I., 293.
Synod (the holy permanent, of Russia), IV., 107.
Synodal courts, II., 253.
Σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, I., 436, 465.
Synods, provincial, held in abeyance, II., 251, 253.
Syrianus, Neo-Platonist, I., 343.
System (feudal), II., 96, 245.

T.

Tabernacles, III., 152.
Taborites, III., 112.
Tallyrand, IV., 114.
Tamburini, IV., 45.
Tanchelm, II., 469.
Tancred of Lecce, II., 411.
Tanner (Adam), III., 122.
Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, II., 156.
Tasso (Torquato), III., 488.
Tatars or Tartars, II., 336.
Tatian, Apologist first, I., 203; then Gnostic, I., 227.

Tauler (John), III., 129, 158.
Telemachus (Monk), I., 520.
Temperance Societies, IV., 187.
Templars, Knights, II., 504; their suppression, III., 10, 11.
Territorial (System), III., 398; IV.,79.
Tertius Ordo de pœnitentia, or Tertiaries, II., 514.
Tertullian, I., 185, 204, 240, 250, 268, 279, 317.
Test-oath III., 340.
Tetzel, III., 188.
Teutonic (Knights), II., 505; III., 174.
Thaddeus (Apostle), I., 129.
Thangbraud, II., 167.
Theatines, III., 455.
Thebæan legion, I., 194.
Thebutis, chief of the Ebonites, I., 150.
Theganus, II., 301.
Themistius and his partisans, I., 343, 432.
Themistius, Neo-Platonist, I., 343.
Theodatus, King of the Ostrogoths, II., 26.
Theodora (Empress), I., 433.
Theodore Askidas, I., 435; Bp. of Cæsarea, ., 438.
Theodore, Archbp. of Canterbury, II., 61.
Theodore Cassiteras, II., 157.
Theodore, Lector of Constantinople, I., 26.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, I., 416, 419, 422, 436.
Theodore, Bp. of Pharan, I., 443.
Theodore Studita, II., 157.
Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus, I., 25, 346, 419, 422, 433, 436.
Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, II., 25, 36.
Theodosius I., the Great, I., 338, 512.
Theodosius II., the Younger, I., 340, 425.
Theodosius (Capuchin), IV., 290.
Theodotus, the Elder, the Tanner, I., 242.
Theodotus, the Younger, the Money-changer, I., 243.
Theodulph, Bp. of Orleans, II., 126.
Theological (tendencies), I., 258, 394; II., 535 sq., 560.
Theologumena, I., 3.
Theophilanthropists, IV., 125.
Theophilus of Alexandria, I., 339.
Theophilus of Antioch (Apologist), I., 204.
Theophylactus, Archbp. of Achrida, II., 334.
Theophylactus, Archbp. of Bulgaria, II., 334.
Θεοτόκος, I., 415.
Theresa (St.), III., 459.
Therapeutai, I., 85
Thevin (Council of), I., 443.
Thiersch, IV., 354, 376.
Thirty years' war, III., 498 sq.
Tholuck, IV., 355.
Thomas (Apostle), I., 129.
Thomas Aquinas, II., 433, 552.
Thomas Barsumas, I., 422.
Thomas à Becket, II., 404 sq.
Thomas of Celano (author of "*Dies iræ*"), III., 156.
Thomas de Vio, of Gaëta. See *Cajetan.*
Thomas à Kempis, III., 132, 151.
Thomas Waldensis, III., 99.
Thomas (Christians of St. Thomas), I., 423.
Thomasius, IV., 32, 365.
Thomassini, I., 33.
Thomists, II., 560.
Thorn (Conference of), III., 301, 497.
Thrasamund, II., 22.
Thurificati, I., 189, 299.
Thurles (National Synod of), IV., 273.
Thyestian (banquets), I., 179, 304.
Thym, I., 43.
Tiara, I., 485.
Tiberius (Emperor), I., 103, 132
Tillemont, I., 34.
Tilly, III., 501.
Timothy, I., 123, 131.
Tipasa (Martyrs of), I., 20.
Tiraboschi, IV., 44.
Tiridates, King of Armenia, I., 350.
Tirini (Interpreter), III., 479.
Tithes, I., 276, 461; II., 95, 255.
Tithes of Saladin, II., 409.
Titian, III., 171, 488.
Titular Bishops (*in partibus infidelium*), II., 465.
Titus (Roman General), I., 134.
Titus (disciple of St. Paul's), I., 131.
Toland, IV., 36.
Toledo (Councils of), I., 386, 512; II., 20.
Toleration (Edict of Joseph), IV., 104.
Toleto (Francis), III., 477.
Tolosa (Council of), II., 282.
Tongres (See of), II., 80.
Tonsure, I., 486; controversy on the tonsure, II., 64.
Torgau (League of Protestant princes made at T.), III., 217.
Tostatus (Alphonse), III., 139.
Toul (See of), II., 80.
Toulouse (Council of), II., 282; III., 120, 151.

Tournay (See of), II., 80.
Tournely, IV., 32.
Tours (Councils of), II., 118, 320.
Tours (School of), II., 266.
Tradition (Pharasaical), I., 86.
Tradition of the Catholic Church, I., 249 sq.
Traditores, I., 193, 358.
Traducianism, I., 393.
Trajan, I., 181.
Translation of Bishops reserved to the Pope, II., 454.
Translations of the Holy Scriptures, I., 78; II., 17; III., 141, 210, 246, 297, 480, IV., 44.
Transubstantiation, I., 303, 500; II. 316 sq., 318 sq.
Transubstantiation, when this word was used for the first time, II., 419; although the dogma existed at all times, I., 301, 500.
Transylvania, III., 303.
Trappists, IV., 40; in America, IV., 332.
Trautson, Archbp. of Vienna, IV., 54.
Treaty of the 15th of Sept., 1864 (Violation of the), IV., 223.
Trent (See of), II., 77.
Trent (Council of), negotiations on it, III., 268; celebration of the Council, III., 422 sq.; acquiescence in its decrees, III., 435 sq.
Treuga Dei. See *Truce of God.*
Treves (See of), II., 80.
Tribonianus (Jurisconsult), I., 432.
Tribur (German Council of), II., 266.
Tribur (Assembly of), II., 359.
Trichotomy (Platonian), of man, I., 393.
Trimurti of the Hindoos, I., 54.
Trinitarians (Order of , II., 501.
Trinitas and Τρίας, terms employed for the first time, I., 257; scientific development of this dogma, I., 256 sq.; distortion to Tritheism, II., 535; denial of this mystery by the Antitrinitarians, I., 242; III., 418; by the Socinians, III., 428; modern Rationalists, IV., 86.
Trinity (Religious Order of the). See *Trinitarians.*
Trinitatis festum, III., 155.
Trinoda necessitas, II., 272.
Tritenheim (John), I., 30.
Tritheism, ., 432; II., 535.
Triumphus (Augustinus) See *Augustine.*
Trivium, II., 125; III., 133.
Trosly (Council of), II., 260.
Troubadours, II., 480, 565.
Truce of God, II., 265, 293.
Trullian Synod, I., 448, 451.
Trullian Synod (Observation), I., 451.
Turketul, II., 284.
Turrecremata. See *John.*
Turretin, I., 43.
Tursellin, III., 452, 481.
Τύπος, Edict of faith, I., 447.
Twesten, IV., 351.
Tyniec (Abbey of), II., 180.
Tyrannicide (Doctrine of), III., 394, 443.
Tyre (Pseudo-synod of), I., 371.

U.

Uchansky, Archbp. of Gnesen, III., 299.
Uhlich, IV., 353.
Ulenberg, III., 2, 484.
Ulfila, II., 17.
Ulric (St.), Bp. of Augsburg, II., 267, 286.
Unigenitus (Bull), IV., 22.
Union; tentatives of union between Protestants and Catholics, IV., 47 sq.
Union (Hypostatic), of the two natures in J. Christ, I., 254, 413, 421.
Unitarians, III., 418.
United States of North America, IV., 329 sq., 372 sq.
Unity of the Church, I., 281 sq., 286.
Unity of Faith, I., 148, 252.
Universal (Bishop), I., 472.
Universities, II., 523; III., 179.
Unni, Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, II., 165.
Unwan, Archbishop of Bremen, II., 268.
Ὑπόστασις, I., 255.
Upper Rhine (Eccl. Prov. of the), IV., 211 sq., 280 sq.
Upsala (See of), Metropolis of Sweden, II., 167.
Upsala (Discussion of), III., 305.
Urban II., Pope, II., 368, 371.
Urban IV., Pope, II., 429; III., 153.
Urban V., Pope, III., 20, 150.
Urban VI., Pope, III., 23, 154, 174.
Urban VII., Pope, III., 438.
Urban VIII., Pope, III., 440.
Ursacius of Singidunum, I., 375, 378.
Ursula (St.), and her companions, I., 187, note 3.
Ursulines, III., 460.
Usher, I., 42.
Utrecht (Metropolis), II., 81.
Utrecht (Jansenist Schism of), IV., 24, 189.

V.

Vairesse, IV., 37.

Valdez (Alphonse), III., 209.
Valence (Councils of), I., 421; II., 244, 301.
Valens (Emperor), I., 338, 381.
Valens of Mursia, in Pannonia, I., 375.
Valentine the Gnostic, I., 221.
Valentine the Missionary, II., 77.
Valentinian I., I., 338.
Valentinian II., I., 338, 381.
Valentinian III., I., 340, 473.
Vallarsi, IV., 44.
Vallombrosa (Order of), II., 262, 271.
Vandals, II., 20.
Vannes (Congr. of St.), III., 458.
Varlet (Dominic), IV., 25.
Vasquez, III., 477, 485.
Vega (Lope de), III., 488.
Veith (Emmanuel), IV., 294.
Venema (Herman), I., 43.
Veneration of the Saints, I., 208; II., 150.
Venice (Peace of), II., 403.
Vercelli (Council of), II., 319.
Verden (See of), II., 90.
Verdun (See of), II., 80.
Verdun (Treaty of), II., 191.
Vergerius, the Pope's Nuncio, III., 258.
Vernulæus, III., 452.
Verona (Council of), III., 119.
Veronius, III., 496.
Vespasian (Emperor), I., 134.
Vespasiani, Bp. of Fano, I., 485, note.
Vestibule of a Church, I., 482.
Viborg (See of), II., 166.
Vicars of the Pope, II., 247.
Vicars-General, II., 464.
Victor I., Pope, I., 242, 244, 310.
Victor II., Pope, II., 233.
Victor III., Pope, II., 368.
Victor IV., Pope, II., 398.
Victorinus, Bp. of Petavio, I., 173.
Victorinus (Hymns of), I., 487.
Vienne (Council of), III., 6. Conf. I., 167.
Viger (Jesuit), III., 452.
Vigil, I., 311.
Vigilantius, I., 533.
Vigilius, Pope, I., 437.
Vigor, III., 423.
Villani (Giovanni), III., 1, 134.
Vilmar, IV., 347, 358.
Vincent of Beauvais, I., 30; II., 523, 562.
Vincent (St.), Bp. of Capua, I., 379.
Vincent (St.), Ferrer, III., 25, 158, 173.
Vincent of Lerins, I., 356, 411.
Vincent (St.) of Paul, III., 449 sq.
Vinci (Leonardo dà), III., 169.
Vindonissa (See of), II., 73
Vineis (Peter *de*). See *Peter.*
Viret (Peter), III., 282.
Virgilius, Bp. of Salzburg, II., 173, 278.
Virginity, I., 146, 277 sq.
Vischer, III., 167.
Visigoths, II., 19.
Visitation (Feast of the) of the B. V., III., 154.
Visitation (Order of the), III., 459.
Visitation of diocese and Visitors, I., 463; II., 100.
Visitation (Parochial), II., 100.
Vitalian (Pope), II., 61.
Viterbo (Giles of), III., 77, 147.
Vivès (Louis and Erasmus), III., 138, 477.
Voit, IV., 32.
Voltaire, II., 192; IV., 38, 69.
Voss, I., 42.
Votive Masses, I., 504.
Vulfilach (Deacon), Stylite, I., 529.
Vulgate (Amended), III., 438.
Vulgate, new amendment, with the aid of the Hebrew and Greek texts, II., 563 sq.; III., 438.

W.

Wadstena (Convent of), III., 151, 312.
Wafers, or unleavened altar bread, I., 506; II., 289.
Walafried Strabo, II., 160, 304.
Walbodo (St.), Bp. of Liége, II., 268
Walch, father and son, I., 39.
Waldenses, II., 472 sq., 508.
Waldrada, II., 201.
Wallia, King of the Visigoths, II., 19.
Walter, or Gauthier of St. Victor, II., 546.
Walter von der Vogelweide, II., 565.
Walter (writer on C. L.), IV., 298.
Waltram, Bp. of Naumburg, II., 361, note.
Ward, Mary (Visitation-nun), III., 461.
Warsaw (Peace of Religion), III., 299.
Warszewicki (Jesuit), III., 308.
Wazon, Bp. of Liége II., 269, 304.
Wednesday (fast-day), I., 307; II., 12.
Wegscheider, IV., 362.
Weigel (Valentin), III., 403.
Weigelians, III., 403.
Weigl, III., 132 note.
Weishaupt, IV., 59.
Weislinger, III., 140, note; IV., 48, 103.
Weismann, Ch. Hist., I., 39.
Wenceslaus, II., 177.
Wends, II., 177.
Weininger (S. J.), IV., 328.

Wertheim (Bible), IV., 87.
Wesel (John), III., 115.
Wesley (John and Charles), IV., 97.
Wesprim (See of), II., 182.
Wessel (John), III., 116.
Wessenberg, IV., 309.
Westphalia (Peace of), III., 504.
Westeräs (See of), II., 167; diet of, III., 307.
Wexiö (See of), II., 167.
Wicelius (George), III., 475.
Wicliffe, III., 96.
Wieland, IV., 93.
Wigand, III., 407.
Wilfrid, II., 63.
William II., King of Sicily, II., 394.
William Allen, III., 332.
William of Auvergne, II., 551.
William of Champeaux, II., 49[1], 536.
William Durandus, III., 9.
William Nogaret. See *Nogaret.*
William of St. Amour, II., 517.
William of Plasian, II., 448.
William of Thierry, II., 538, 547.
William of Tyre, I., 30.
Willibrord (St.), Archbp. of Utrecht, II., 81.
Willigis, Archbp. of Mentz, II., 223, 226, 268.
Wilna (See of), III., 174.
Wimpina (Conrad), III., 191, 237.
Windesheim, monastery of Canons Regular, III., 151.
Windischmann, I., 51; IV., 296.
Windows (Stained glass), in churches, III., 164.
Wine (Practice of mingling water with the) in the sacrifice of the altar, I., 507.
Winer, IV., 354.
Winifried, II., 84.
Wirland (See of), II., 576.
Wiseman (Cardinal), IV., 183, 265, 267.
Witasse, IV., 32.
Witches (Trials of), III., 121, 144.
Witches, combated by Catholics, III., 493.
Witches, upheld by Protestants, III., 122.
Witiza, II., 82.
Wittekind, II., 89.
Wladimir the Great, II., 338.
Wladislaus IV., King of Poland, III., 301.
Wohlgemuth, III., 171.
Wolf, Church Historian, I., 37.
Wolfenbüttel (Fragments of), IV., 91.
Wolfgang (St.), Bp. of Ratisbon, II., 268.
Wolfram of Eschenbach, II., 565
Wollin (See of), II., 575.
Wöllner, Prussian minister, IV., 91, 347.
Wollmar (Melchior), III., 281.
Woodstock College, Md., IV., 332.
Works (Good works), controversy on, III., 405.
Worms (Concordat of), II., 386.
Worms (Diet of), III., 207.
Worms (Assembly of Bishops at), II., 357.
Woolston, IV., 36.
Worship. See *Cultus.*
Wouters, I., 35.
Writers (Ecclesiastical), I., 16, note 2.
Wührer, II., 3, note 1.
Wujek (James), Jesuit, III., 300.
Wullram, Bp. of Sens, II., 81.
Würzburg (See of), II., 80; (League of), III., 499; (Assembly of German bishops,) IV., 278.

X.

Xaverian Brothers, IV., 334.
Xavier (St. Francis), III., 466.
Xenaias, Bp. of Hierapolis, I., 430.
Xenodocheia, II., 460.
Xerophagy, I., 493.
Ximenes (Cardinal), III., 139, 178.

Y.

Year of the Birth of Christ, I., 99.
York (See of), I., 174; II., 49, 59.
York (Metropolis), II., 253.
York (School of), II., 253.
Yxküll (See of), II., 573.

Z.

Zaccaria, IV., 50.
Zachary (Pope), II., 29, 38.
Zeil (Jesuit), IV., 300.
Zeitblom (Barth.), III., 171.
Zeitz (See of), II., 178.
Zeller, IV., 358.
Zend-Avesta and people of Zend, I., 56, note 3.
Zeno (Emperor), I., 430.
Zimmer (Dogmatician), IV., 293.
Zinzendorf, IV., 94.
Ziska (John), III., 111.
Zola, I., 36.
Zoroaster, I., 56.
Zosimus (Pope), I., 407.
Zosimus (Pagan Historian), I., 322.
Zülpich (Tolbiacum) (battle of), II., 36, 75.
Zwickau (Prophets of), III., 262.
Zwinglius, III., 255, 401; his system, III., 250 sq.

Alzog, J. BQX
81
Manual od universal Church .A5
history. v.4